DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 376 UD 022 745

AUTHOR	Holmes, Manford
TITLE	An Examination of Two Technical Assistance Styles Within One Project. Draft. Documentation and Technical Assistance in Urban Schools.
INSTITUTION	Center for New Schools, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; Oregon Univ., Eugene. Center for Educational Policy and Management.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. School Capacity for Problem Solving Group.
PUB DATE	Oct 77
CONTRACT	400-75-0018
NOTE	152p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - General (140)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Information Utilization; *Linking Agents; *Program Effectiveness; *Technical Assistance; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Chicago Public Schools IL; *Documentation and Technical Assistance Project; Oakland Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the implementation of technical assistance strategies to enhance urban public school improvement in the Oakland, California, and Chicago, Illinois, school districts. The assistance strategies were developed under the Documentation and Technical Assistance Project (DTA) of the Center for New Schools in Chicago, and implemented by the regional technical assistance teams of Eugene (Oregon)/Oakland and Chicago. The paper presents an analytical framework for examining team assistance styles, consisting of six stages: exchanging information, distinguishing roles, building relationships, identifying and making links, using materials, and checking for usefulness. The assistance styles of each team are analyzed by describing how the stages in the framework were carried out in the following activities: (1) team organization; (2) entry into school assistance sites; (3) provision of assistance; and (4) withdrawal from the site. Next, the paper discusses changes that the assistance process brought about in different areas of the local school context. Finally, issues that emerged from the assistance process are considered and presented as tools for analyzing past work and planning future strategies in technical assistance provision for urban school improvement. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228376

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

AN EXAMINATION OF TWO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE STYLES WITHIN ONE PROJECT

Manford Holmes

October 1977

DRAFT VERSION

FOR LIMITED CIRCULATION ONLY

UD 022 745

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Documentation and Technical Assistance in Urban Schools Project (DTA) is an effort to learn more about how to make urban public schools work better for urban students. Toward this end, DTA combines educational research and practice within one project. DTA's mandate has three interrelated parts:

> DOCUMENTATION - to study, using primarily ethnographic techniques, the ways in which selected urban schools organize themselves to solve problems. Documentation focuses upon nine sites throughout the country selected and funded by NIE to continue to engage in locally initiated improvement activities.
>
> TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE - to develop in practice specific strategies which are designed to improve urban public schooling. Technical assistance strategies are based in part upon documentation of useful practices in the nine funded sites.
>
> LINKAGE - to increase understanding, through observation of DTA's attempts to link documentation with technical assistance, of the processes through which research can be useful to practice, and practice can influence research.

Our work is designed to effect school improvement through direct work in urban public schools and through sharing what we learn with the following audiences: parents, teachers, and administrators of urban public schools; the educational research community; groups or agencies working to assist urban schools; policy makers.

ACKNOLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Jacqueline Berry and Ann Boule, who besides being involved in the early stages of writing this document, were also responsible for a major portion of the data collection, and its analysis and interpretation. Other Study Team members who provided support in the handling, sorting and coding of the data were Sylvia Smith, Andrea Ashmore and Michael Donnella. Team consultants Jay Schensul, Richard Johnson and Pertti Pelto assisted in analyzing data, and provided the Study Team with additional perspectives on the work of the assistance teams in Chicago and Oakland. They contributed a great deal to this paper.

A special thank you to Anne Wilson for her assistance in organizing and making coherent the ideas expressed here. Her editorial support in structuring the paper to meet the needs of the dual audience the Study Team is attempting to address was invaluable. Appreciation is expressed to Hannah Meara and Thomas Wilson who also helped to structure this paper to address the dual audience question and who provided critiques of the paper in its various stages as well. Consultant William Sampson and the DTA staff advisors as a whole were very helpful in raising questions and issues throughout Phase II, all of which assisted the Study Team in making the project's self study processes concrete. And a final thank you to Midge Tatje, Gloria Spann, Dorothy Kahn, Micky Forbes and Sarah Marter for their help in the production of the paper.

This paper is part of the Documentation and Technical Assistance Project of the Center for New Schools, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Illinois and of the Center for Educational Policy and Management, 1472 Kincaid Street, Eugene, Oregon. This Project is funded by the School Capacity for Problem Solving Program of the National Institute of Education, Contract #400-75-0018. The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect views of that agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DTA Overview....................i

Acknowledgements....................ii

Preface....................iv

I. Introduction....................1
   A. Introduction....................2
   B. Backgrounds of the Technical Assistance Regions....................4
   C. Descriptions of the Oakland School District and District 21 in Chicago....................5
   D. The Assistance Process....................5

II. The Style of the Eugene/Oakland Technical Assistance Region....................11
   A. Organization of the Team....................12
   B. Establishing Entry....................18
   C. Providing Assistance....................29
   D. Withdrawal from Assistance....................50

III. The Style of the Chicago Technical Assistance Region....................58
   A. Organization of the Team....................59
   B. Establishing Entry....................69
   C. Providing Assistance....................81
   D. Withdrawal from Assistance....................125

IV. Effects of Technical Assistance....................129
   A. Changes in the Physical Environment....................132
   B. Organizational Structures within the School Community....................132
   C. Roles of Participants....................132
   D. Access to Information and Assistance Resources....................133
   E. Skills and Talents of Participants....................133
   F. Tools which Participants can Use, including Questions....................133
   G. Operational and Conceptual Models to which Participants have been Exposed....................134
   H. The Combined Experience and Information Base of Participants....................134

V. Technical Assistance Issues....................136
   A. Organization of Team....................138
   B. Establishing Entry and Preparing for Withdrawal....................139
   C. Providing Assistance....................140
   D. Issues about the Facilitator Role....................142
   E. Issues about Linkage....................143

References....................145

PREFACE

The Study Team so far has only two DTA examples to draw from in pulling out issues about planning and implementing sustained, face to face technical assistance within the DTA context. Because of having a more comprehensive information base about its work, the Chicago Region has been treated more fully and probably with more understanding in this paper. Additionally, a choice was made to report fully on activities which involve activities with nine sites information; here too, there was more information available to the Study Team in the Chicago experience. Within the limits of the circumstances influencing the development of the paper, however, the author has tried to represent fairly and with critical attention the issues which arose in the work of the two regions.

This paper as a whole is a careful presentation of the work of the two technical assistance teams in the DTA project. The ideas expressed in this paper are not presented as final judgments on the usefulness and value of the teams' strategies for providing technical assistance. The Study Team's role is to observe and represent for others as much as possible of the process, context and effects of providing assistance within the DTA technical assistance regions.

This paper is written for both internal and external readers. The mandate of the Study Team as an internal study component of our work requires this dual readership. At this point in the Study Team's history it is necessary to present an overall perspective and description of the assistance teams' activities to outside audiences. On the other hand, the Study Team must provide analysis and ideas that allow the DTA staff to continue to learn from and to refine different approaches in the project, guided by the questions and issues raised in this paper. This draft is subject to further internal review beyond the editorial review that will be necessary for the completion of most of the other DTA papers. The additional review is necessary to give consideration to the reactions of the assistance teams to ideas expressed in this draft. This internal review process was beginning at the time of this writing. The internal review of this draft must include technical assistance team members' reactions as well as those expressed by other readers. We look forward to receiving comments and critiques from those who read this draft.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to describe and analyze the process and effects of implementing two different DTA technical assistance strategies, one in Oakland and one in Chicago public schools. The Eugene/Oakland Region organized and implemented assistance strategies around a theme of "Organizational Development" and the Chicago Region organized and implemented assistance strategies around a theme of "Building from Cultural Strengths". We refer to the ideas and processes emanating from these themes as the regions' styles.

We use the following six frames to examine the assistance process and to consider the assistance effects in the two Regions:

1. Exchanging information.
2. Distinguishing roles.
3. Building relationships.
4. Identifying and making links.
5. Using materials.
6. Checking for usefulness.

The paragraphs which follow describe the Study Team sources used to develop this paper, explain the role of the DTA New York Region and why it is not included in the analysis, and describe the DTA charge to the Eugene/Oakland and Chicago Regions.

The body of the paper will: (1) describe the two Regions' themes; (2) describe the school districts in which the two assistance teams worked; (3) describe the assistance process in each Region applying the six frames to four overlapping stages of assistance; (4) describe the effects of technical assistance; and (5) present issues to be considered about the relationship between processes and effects in planning and implementing technical assistance.

The primary data base for the writing of this paper is the Study Team's collection of Field Data Forms (FDFs). The Study Team field researchers based in Oakland and Chicago, and in some cases the Study Team Director, observed and completed an FDF for most intervention activities in the field and for some team planning activities. A coding system was developed and used to organize the information in the FDFs around the issues to be considered in this paper.

The Study Team held formal feedback sessions with technical assistance teams after certain key assistance activities, usually preparing written summaries of the sessions. Interviews with assistance team members and key site participants were planned, carried out, and summarized around particular issues or questions. Copies of many documents prepared by the assistance regions were given to the Study Team, including plans, letters, memos, reports, papers and video materials. At regular Study Team work meetings to share ideas and plan follow-up activities, members also shared information from ongoing discussions with assistance team members, other DTA staff, some site participants, and Study Team consultants. Informal discussions, besides expanding the team's information base, also provided opportunities for others to ask questions of Study Team members. An effects questionnaire was developed and pretested, and will be revised and used again. Some of the respondents' questionnaire comments have been included in the body of this paper.

The work of DTA New York Region is not within the scope of this paper because the charge to the New York Region was limited to strategy development and did not include implementation. The New York Region was a source of nine sites' information for the Chicago and Eugene/Oakland Regions. In particular, some Region assistance staff and site participants attended and participated in certain of the New York seminars, which were designed partly to support linkage with information from the nine sites.

The DTA charge to the two technical assistance regions had two parts:

1. To develop strategies toward increasing problem solving capacity based on nine sites' data at the local school level.
2. To implement and test these strategies.

The Study Team recognizes and appreciates the difficulty of performing these exploratory tasks.

Backgrounds of the Technical Assistance Regions

Introduction

This section will describe the development of the themes of the two Regions and will present factors which contributed to the emergence of their different styles of work. The section is incomplete in the present draft. Components of each section are outlined below.

Eugene/Oakland Region

This section will include the following:

Previous work and other experience of the assistance team members;
Brief description of the setting of the team;
Brief description of the current relationship of the team with its organizational support base;
Description of the organizing theme of the Region;
Summary description of the Region's plans for its own organization and work including: selecting team members, defining roles, selecting sites, goals for assistance work, and issues and problems.

Chicago Region

This section will include the same components as the previous section.

Descriptions of the Oakland School District and District 21 in Chicago

Introduction

This section will describe the settings in which the two assistance teams organized and carried out their work. Components of each section are outlined below.

Oakland School District

This section will include the following:

General description;
Basic demographic information;
History of DTA contacts with the district;
Goals;
How specific schools relate to the district;
District structure.

District 21 in Chicago

This section will include the same components as the previous section.

The Assistance Process

This section describes how the styles of the two teams manifested themselves in the assistance work, examined through six frames. Influenced by published literature and our own earlier conceptualizations, six frames emerged through the ongoing process of observation recording, and discussing which depict best the assistance process. The Study Team sees each as a useful window through which to consider the different types of activities and events in which assisters engage. The frames also provide useful concepts for considering assistance effects and clarifying issues about the relationship between processes and effects.

Each of the frames potentially can apply to any assistance event within the scope of the assistance teams' work with the sites. The frames apply across the range of types of events, from a formal workshop through a casual conversation. The frames apply over time, from organizing the assistance team for the work, through initial entry events, through the whole scope of large and small assistance events, to the last steps of withdrawal. The frames also are useful tools for examining each other.

Exchanging Information

There is information exchange in every assistance event. The information may be fact, theory, or lore, or combinations of different kinds of information. The information may be exchanged in documentary form, in face to face encounters, or by a combination of both (For a discussion of these concepts see Holmes, 1977a). Information exchanged in face to face situations includes the verbal content, the non-verbal content, and the implications participants draw from the setting in which the information exchange is happening. The flow of information may be primarily one way, either from people in the assistance site to the members of the assistance team, or from the assistance team members to the site people, or it may be primarily interactive. While the information exchanges occasionally involve only one person reacting to a documentary source of information, the exchanges usually involve at least two individuals and often large groups.

Distinguishing Roles

Every participant has some role in every assistance event. This frame is concerned with identifying the primary roles developed and used by the assistance team, and certain roles used by site participants. This includes who is taking initiative, who is being responsive, and who is working collaboratively in different situations. It includes how individual and team roles change and do not change over time and from situation to situation.

Building Relationships

Building relationships is both a broad and a complex aspect of all assistance work. The status of the interactive relationships between the assistance team members and site participants always requires some attention from the assistance team. While a relationship may be characterized in certain ways at a specific moment in time, it never becomes frozen, and is always subject to change. Building relationships is part of laying the foundation for all assistance work. The nature of the relationship influences what kinds of information can be exchanged, what kinds of roles can be undertaken, what links can be established, the kinds of materials that are suggested, requested, and used, and the usefulness of specific information and events.

Three broad categories of relationship with which the assistance team must concern itself are: (1) relationships between team members, (2) relationships with district personnel, and (3) relationships with local school people. These relationships may be strengthened or weakened by different specific events and kinds of events.

Identifying and Making Links

Establishing connections of activities, ideas and processes at the assistance site with activities, ideas and processes outside the site is a process that does not occur in all assistance events. Linking is closely connected with the other five frames. The three broad areas between which links are made are: (1) nine sites information, (2) assistance team's theme and action agenda, and (3) past experience and current needs of the local school site.

Identifying links is a useful process in screening information during the information exchange process. This screening can identify a common experience base as a preliminary to drawing more specific information out of that source, or identify potentially useful information and information sources to meet site needs. Identifying links is also a useful tool in building relationships, developing and using roles, and selecting and using materials. Identifying links channels the assistance effort toward finding potentially useful information for the assistance process. Checking for usefulness, when it occurs, comes after the information has been put to use in specific assistance activities.

Using Materials

This frame asks where, to what extent, and how the assistance team uses different materials in its work. Do certain kinds of materials tend to get used in certain kinds of events? The types of materials considered in this frame are: (1) written materials, (2) audio and video tapes, and (3) visual materials. How are materials used in exchanging information, building relationships, and identifying links? Does the use of certain materials coincide with certain roles? How is the usefulness of materials checked?

Checking for Usefulness

Checking for usefulness is defined here as an ongoing activity which can happen at all levels and stages of the assistance process. It happens both formally and informally and is part of the team's ongoing work at all levels, including checks by participants to see if what the team is doing is useful. Formal feedback sessions are structures designed specifically to support this process and are examples of events where the checking for usefulness is more comprehensive. It will be more difficult to consider usefulness questions when the outcome of events did not match the expectations of the assistance team members.

In discussing the checking for usefulness of information and events, we differentiate three needs. A particular event or piece of information may be useful to one need without being directly useful to the others. The three needs are of: (1) the DTA Project in terms of gaining knowledge about the implementation of problem solving capacity in school communities, (2) the school(s) and school district as defined by site participants, and (3) the assistance team agendas, which include:

(a) The team's overall strategy which encompasses:

- DTA purpose
- Site needs
- team theme
- team assumptions and knowledge about how the assistance process works.

(b) The team's organizational support base and short- and long-range goals beyond the specific assistance work.

In addition to examining the assistance process through the six frames just described, the Study Team also examines the process by looking consecutively at four overlapping stages in that process. While events pertaining to (1) organizing the team, (2) establishing entry, (3) providing assistance, and (4) withdrawing from assistance, can occur at any time in the assistance process, they fell mainly into the sequence given above.

Each of these stages will be examined through each of the six frames. While this provides a somewhat complex structure for the section, the assistance process which the paper attempts to represent and analyze in some of its parts is in actuality considerably more complex.

You, the reader, are asked to do two things: (1) Understand that information on individuals, groups, settings, and activities is cumulatively presented through different sections of the paper, requiring you to draw together, remember, and apply information presented elsewhere as it relates to the particular section of the paper being considered; (2) not only consider both the explicit and implicit connections and conclusions made in the paper, but also allow the information and perspectives presented here to interact with your own broad knowledge and experiences to test the usefulness, validity and power of the concepts, patterns and issues contained in the paper.

The discussion of the Eugene/Oakland assistance process cannot examine each or even most of the separate assistance events which occurred. The Eugene/Oakland event chart is being prepared from Study Team data to represent the scope of the major assistance events engaged in by the Region, giving one kind of context within which to place the events which are discussed.

(The chart will be inserted in a later draft.)

CHAPTER II: THE STYLE OF THE EUGENE/OAKLAND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REGION

This chapter examines the assistance process in the Eugene/Oakland Region during each of four stages: (1) the organization of the team; (2) establishing entry at assistance sites; (3) providing assistance; and (4) withdrawal from the assistance site. Examination is in terms of the six frames outlined in the first chapter.

Organization of the Team

Exchanging Information

A teamwide effort to share as much information as possible among team members was achieved more extensively between the Eugene-based members of the team, who had frequent opportunities for face to face interaction with each other. For instance, the Eugene-based team members collaborated in the reading of the nine sites case studies, each member reading two or more, and everyone discussing each case study together. For the Eugene-based staff, information exchange through both face to face and documentary modes was emphasized and carried through. The face to face exchanges often occurred in small group settings and were often organized around process issues, in harmony with the organizational development theme of the region. The written exchanges were often shaped in a descriptive, theoretical and analytical manner, which was in harmony with the norms of the university setting in which the Eugene-based part of the team exists. The Eugene staff created and maintained an extensive file system to support information exchange, which included records of all team meetings as well as key events at the sites and copies of materials used at the sites.

Face to face information exchanges between the Eugene/Oakland team and the rest of DTA were primarily mediated through the Team Leader who had periodic conversations and meetings with the Project Director and other members of the Leadership Team.

The Oakland-based team members for the most part fell outside of these patterns of information exchange. While the two Oakland-based roles of the Eugene/Oakland team were created partly to increase the amount of face to face information exchange between the assistance team and school people, geographic distance played an important role in limiting the participation of the Oakland-based assistance staff in the Region's information exchanges.

Distinguishing Roles

The Region instituted a co-convener structure, whereby different combinations of two of the ten team members jointly convened each of the seven different subprojects the Region designed for itself. The co-convener structure was used to distribute responsibility, maximize information exchange between the seven subprojects, and allow different team members to work intensively together on different aspects of the work.

Two key roles were filled by the most experienced members of the team. The Team Leader had formal responsibility to the Project Director for the Region's work. The Technical Assistance-Documentation Linker had formal responsibility for matching the informational needs of the sites and the team with nine sites data and appropriate other sources (for discussion of this role see Holmes, 1977b).

While the recording and minute keeping function was shared among team members on a rotating basis, one person was responsible for helping to establish and maintain the information storage system.

Of the entire Eugene/Oakland team of nine (the number changed to ten during the second phase of the project), seven were cast to play some sort of direct assistance role. Three exclusively provided back-up and/or preparation of written products. The two individuals who were responsible for negotiating entry also were responsible for coordinating and carrying out specific assistance work. The Oakland-based assisters, first one person and later two, spent significantly more time at the Oakland sites than did any of the Eugene-based assisters.

Even though one of the Oakland-based assisters became a task co-convener in February 1977, the Oakland-based assisters had less decision making authority within the team structure then the Eugene-based assisters. The Oakland-based assisters were expected to (1) gather and share information with site participants; (2) carry out some groundwork and follow through for planned assistance activities; (3) conduct some assistance activities at the District Level (Connie, an Oakland-based assister) and at the local school level (Bettye and Janis, Oakland-based assisters); and (4) advise the team about future directions of the assistance work.

Building Relationships

While building relationships was an important dimension of providing assistance for the Eugene/Oakland team, and in harmony with their organizational development theme, the Eugene-based part of the team had to work through two substantial difficulties in doing their assistance work. These were: (1) that Oakland and Eugene are separated by 546 miles, and (2) the team's previous experience with predominantly Black or multicultural urban settings was limited. Because of the distance factor, the settings and contexts for interaction between team members and site participants were limited to Oakland. Also, it was difficult for the whole assistance staff to participate together in any single assistance event, and site participants never met the entire Region staff as a team or met at the team's Eugene setting.

The network of close and supportive working relationships which characterized the Eugene-based part of the team was not developed to include in the same way the team's newer and geographically isolated Oakland-based assisters. The Oakland-based assister positions had been created to increase the opportunities for relationships to develop between the assistance team and site participants, as well as to increase the team's availability at the site level and increase the information flow between the assistance team and site participants. The Oakland-based assisters were in a position to build stronger relationships and exchange considerable information with site participants through face to face exchanges because they were frequently at the school sites. The Study Team perception is that on the whole their relationships with site participants and identification with site needs developed more strongly than their relationships with Eugene-based staff and agenda.

Identifying and Making Links

The TA-Doc Linker role was designed specifically to assign primary responsibility for identifying links between nine sites information and the needs of the assistance sites. Although the primary responsibility was placed on one individual, other team members were encouraged to participate in the linkage process.

While Eugene-based team members were involved in the creation of the role and understood the ways in which it could be shared by other team members, both Oakland-based team members who joined the project after the role had been developed expressed some confusion about who had the primary responsibility to carry out the linkage function. An active exchange of information around linkage did not develop between the TA-Doc Linker and the Oakland-based assisters.

Considering the three broad areas between which links could be drawn, the Oakland-based assisters were often in a position to be able to identify assistance site needs most clearly. They represented the perspectives of the site participants in discussing assistance activities with Eugene-based assisters, and suggested possible ways to link the activities of the team with these needs. The Eugene-based part of the team was in the position to draw together assistance site needs and nine sites information within the context of the team's overall agenda. The flow of information to the Eugene-based staff was restricted not only by the fact of the geographical distance between Oakland and Eugene, but also by the even greater distance between Eugene and the central DTA office in Chicago. The Eugene-based staff relied heavily on written descriptions of nine sites information, such as case studies and FDFs, and occasionally on phone conversations and rare meetings with other members of the project. The team primarily adopted a mediating role between nine sites information sources and site participants.

Using Materials

The Eugene-based part of the team shared extensively in the review, development, and use of relevant materials. This sharing was enhanced by the deliberate building in of opportunities to share materials in the regular meetings of the Eugene-based staff, and by the sharing of many roles and functions within the Eugene group.

Two particular roles were developed to maximize the availability of materials. The TA-Doc Linker role, already mentioned, was designed partly to provide access to relevant computer stored materials, and materials developed in other parts of the DTA project. The TA-Doc Linker designed and carried through a major computer retrieval effort which resulted in a large notebook of computer printouts that were coded around key assistance issues, and was used by the Eugene team and shared at a New York seminar.

While the development of a comprehensive filing system involved the Eugene-based part of the team as a whole, a single individual becam responsible for refining and maintaining the system for the use of the team. The filing system included correspondence, summaries of assistance events, materials used at events, and evaluations of events. It was designed to assist in meeting the day to day informational needs of team members in planning and carrying out assistance activities, writing, as well as in communication with other parts of the project.

Checking for Usefulness

Formal usefulness checks of major assistance events were done, assigned, and/or designed by the co-conveners of each major assistance subproject under which the event fell. The occasional formal feedback sessions were usually special events, but sometimes built into other events such as planning sessions. Written evaluations by site participants were sometimes designed around large events involving many participants. Sometimes the co-conveners took the responsibility of summarizing the usefulness perspectives of various team members and key site people around a specific event.

More informal opportunities for checking the usefulness of information and events to site participants existed for the Oakland-based staff than for the team members commuting from Eugene since they had more day to day contact with site participants. While the geographical distance limited the opportunities for usefulness checks by the Eugene-based staff, it enhanced their opportunities for planning and reflection with less day to day distraction.

Establishing Entry

Exchanging Information

Entry is an ongoing process which begins with the first encounter between members of the assistance team and participants in a potential assistance site. While entry activities dominate the initial stage of the assistance process, entry issues can surface or resurface at any point in the process. Initial entry activities involve exchanging the kinds of information that both the assistance team and district and site participants need in order to develop a working agreement about what assistance is expected and is to be delivered.

The following four questions represent the kinds of information that both the Oakland and Chicago site participants sought, either directly or indirectly, from the assistance teams in the entry process:

- Who are you and where do you come from?
- Why do you want to work here? What if we don't want you?
- What do you have to offer us?
- How do you see yourselves fitting in? How do you envision playing out the role(s) you anticipate?

When these questions come up after the initial entry process has been completed, they signal that renewed attention to entry is appropriate.

Because the Eugene/Oakland team was to be providing assistance and in the primary initiative-taking role in negotiating entry, it had to deal with a larger range of questions, than did site participants although the questions of both groups are equally important. The assistance team responded to and often anticipated the questions site participants asked. In addition, it also considered the following question areas:

- What is the site like, both in particular and in its general characteristics? What is the nature of the relationships between key people and sub-groups in the school setting? What expertise already exists or is claimed within the site staff?
- What are the site needs? What needs are identified by site participants? What needs are assessed by the assistance team?
- How closely do the assistance team capabilities match site needs? In terms of kinds of roles, availability of time, mastery of content, and accessibility of materials?
- How should the entry process be shaped and adapted as it unfolds?

After exchanging information around the entry questions, the question of "What next?" was posed, sometimes by the assistance team and sometimes by site participants. When the process of directly negotiating an assistance agreement began, both parties decided whether it was necessary to exchange more information first, to try one or more short term assistance activities before negotiating the full range of assistance activities desired, or to proceed directly to develop a long term agreement. In the negotiation process the terms of agreement were at various times more or less clear or ambiguous, specific or vague.

Much of the information exchange around entry is not just verbal, but also non-verbal and situational (i.e., kind of dress, where the exchanges take place, ease or unease in the setting). (In a later draft an example will be drawn from the entry process at Greenwood School.)

For its Phase II Plans the Eugene/Oakland Team focused its assistance work at the local school level, especially in the areas of data feedback, intervention, parent involvement and process consultation. In some cases this was done before completing or even substantially beginning entry at the local school level. While the exact focus of the different tasks changed somewhat as the work progressed, the pre-assignment of tasks may have limited to some extent the optimal matching of assistance team resources and skills with school needs.

Distinguishing Roles

While entry as an ongoing process involved the entire assistance staff to some extent, two of the Eugene-based staff did most of the formal negotiating of initial entry. Because the largest constituency of the schools in which the team anticipated concentrating its efforts was Black, the fact that one of the team members was Black was an asset, because this team member shared some kinds of background experience with the majority of the schools' participants.

Initial entry at the District level was begun prior to hiring any Oakland-based staff. District level contacts made during the initial entry process helped identify the kinds of qualities and experience needed in an Oakland-based assistance person. The entire team, including the initial Oakland-based assister when hired, shared in planning and analyzing the continuing entry events on the District-wide level. While Connie, the Oakland-based assistance person, became increasingly important in entry activities because of her previous experience and contacts within the Oakland public schools, she had to move from the Oakland area in the middle of the initial entry process at the local school level. For a time, planning and negotiating initial entry events at the local school level became more concentrated around the different Eugene-based team members who would be providing assistance in those schools.

As a result of a selection process involving local school and district level people, an Oakland-based assister was hired to fill the open spot. When the need arose a few weeks later to hire a second Oakland-based assister, the second candidate from the prior search was hired. As neither of the two current Oakland-based assisters had been hired at the time of the initial district and local level entry events, their experience base for identifying questions and issues related to the team's initial entry was limited.

The two Oakland-based replacement assisters took on a role which had been negotiated and successfully filled by someone neither had had an opportunity to observe. Into their orientation period was compressed learning about the DTA Project, the Eugene/Oakland team, the Oakland School District, the local schools and entry, with the need to continue immediately providing assistance that had already begun.

Building Relationships

While building and maintaining relationships is an important component of all face to face assistance work, it is especially important in the entry process where relationships with key individuals and groups are often first established. Relationships with key individuals at the district and local school levels can help or hinder the entry process, and can influence the development of other relationships.

The spectrum of relationships that the Eugene/Oakland team had to develop in Oakland was quite broad, spreading across the district level and through several schools, three of which we are considering in this paper. The overall route of entry began at the district level and after three to four months spread to local schools.

Entry at the District Level

Building on contacts developed before DTA with the previous superintendent of the Oakland School District, a series of meetings was initiated by the Eugene team with key district level administrators, who had held positions under the previous superintendent, and with the new superintendent. These meetings led to the team's involvement in a series of planning meetings to establish district-wide task groups.

The most important relationship which developed out of these planning sessions was with the district administrator who held the primary responsibility for coordinating the task groups, which were made up of certain principals and appropriate district level personnel. Through him the team became involved in assisting in developing a time line for the creation of the task teams and acted as an information gathering and sharing resource for the overall coordinator and the leaders of the different task groups. The team's information sharing activities ranged from compiling and distributing written materials to holding a variety of workshops covering agenda building, convening meetings, communication and interpersonal skills. The first of these workshops, on convening, conducting, managing and recording intra-group process, was attended by several principals who later provided the team with access to their schools, at least partly out of the relationships begun at the workshop.

Shortly after the planning meetings, one of the assistance team members made a presentation to the Oakland School Board about DTA. Before the Eugene/Oakland team began entry in Oakland, the Oakland Unified School District had begun reorganizing itself and rechanneling its resources around the "back to basics" approach introduced by the new superintendent. The Eugene/Oakland team worked its entry on the District level through that effort. The Region's most important contact at the District level was the coordinator of the task teams, who was soon to be appointed Director of the Division of Curriculum Instruction, a newly formed division within the district. He was the team's primary channel of direct and indirect contact with the Superintendent and other high level district administrators.

While the team became involved with workshops and other district activities through him, most of their assistance concentrated on short range planning and tasks, and they did not negotiate a clear agreement about the full scope and duration of their work at the district-wide level. As a result, there was some misunderstanding when the region stopped providing assistance primarily on a district-wide basis.

Entry at the Local School Level In moving toward entry at the local school

In moving toward entry at the local school level, the Eugene/Oakland team considered several criteria including: (1) whether the principal was receptive to the team members and the ideas they conveyed, (2) whether the principal had a reputation for being an effective leader in his or her school and (3) whether the school was already moving toward adapting and improving its program to better meet the needs of its urban students.

In each of the three schools under consideration here,* the principal arranged, after on site discussions which sometimes included a few other school staff members, for the assistance team to make a presentation to the school staff, followed by a discussion. The presentation included (1) the introduction of DTA staff including Eugene/Oakland assisters and the Study Team Field Researcher, (2) description of DTA including the documentation of the nine sites and the team's relationship to the University of Oregon, and (3) the areas in which the team could possibly provide assistance in helping the school solve its own problems, using the nine sites data to provide models for innovative ideas and strategies in areas such as parental involvement, restructuring the school's approach to education and staff development activities which centered around communicative skills and group processes. The discussion following the presentation provided an opportunity for the assistance team, the principal, and the staff to begin identifying school needs, and for the team members and school staff to begin building relationships with each other and, also to find out more about each other through face to face interaction in small groups.

---

*The Study Team focused its limited resources on documenting the assistance activities at three elementary schools, both because of the project-wide emphasis on the elementary school level and because that was where the Eugene/Oakland team initially spent the most time and effort.

The first contacts with Garden Grove School took place between Richard, a Eugene-based team member, and the principal in the late spring of 1976. The first meetings to negotiate an active DTA involvement were in August, involving Richard and Dick, the Team Leader, first at a luncheon with the principal and then in a needs assessment meeting with the school staff.

A disagreement about the promised or anticipated material resources which the team would provide for the school surfaced in the fall. The principal had expected that substantial resources for the school would come with the team: "I expected from DTA some initial resources . . . we were told that DTA was funded for lots of money . . . that we could ask for anything we wanted." She stated that it was because of the apparent financial resources that she had agreed to let DTA come into the school. The Eugene team members' position was that some overpromising had taken place, yet it was hard to determine how much and when. Whatever the reality of the initial exchanges out of which this misunderstanding grew, the disagreement marked a flaw in the relationship between the principal and the team which influenced subsequent assistance events.

Identifying and Making Links

The linkage, which the Study Team is concerned with describing, is that between nine sites information and assistance site needs and ideas.

In the Eugene/Oakland Region the assistance team usually coordinated the information from the nine sites and the assistance sites. Due to the position of the team, coordination took place around two areas of interaction. One area was that between the assistance team members and nine sites information mediated through the written and human resources of DTA. The other area of interaction was between the assistance team and site participants around the experiences, ideas and needs of the sites.

The Study Team has identified three stages in the linkage process: (1) recognizing a connection between an assistance site and nine sites information; (2) clarifying the connection through focusing on the linkage issue to (a) gather more information about the relevant site characteristics and (b) discuss and share information to clarify the link, and (c) plan activities to use the link with or without the collaboration of site participants; and (3) carrying out activities that attempt to use the nine sites information directly or indirectly to increase the problem solving capacity at the local school level.

The initial entry process in Oakland paralleled the initial analysis of data still coming in to the Documentation Team about the nine sites and occurred before the case studies were written. The initial entry process at the local school level occurred after the initial round of analysis had been completed, but while the case studies were being written. Thus the assistance team was familiarizing itself with nine sites information still entering the DTA information network while the initial entry processes were taking place.

Before being able to make useful connections between the nine sites information and assistance site needs, it was necessary for the team to prepare the way. The team had to become acquainted with the site in its previous experience, current needs, special interests, etc., understanding the relationships between the parts and the whole, before being able to recognize connections between the site and the nine sites information. The site participants had to understand the team's capabilities, purposes and context before deciding the extent to which they wanted to seek assistance from or collaborate with the team. The kinds of relationships that were built between the assistance team and the site participants influenced what kinds of information were exchanged and how information was exchanged. Thus the nature of the entry process itself limited the extent to which the full linkage process could apply.

Using Materials

Materials were used selectively by the Eugene/Oakland team to support entry in two ways. First, a brief written description of DTA and of the team's organizing theme of organizational development were used to supplement and support information presented orally. Second, in the cases of entry at two local schools, photographs and slides were used to represent the range of activities at the nine sites, thereby making more concrete their reality.

Checking for Usefulness

Checking for usefulness can be considered from three perspectives: (1) the degree to which the nine sites information is useful at the assistance site in helping develop problem solving capacity; (2) the degree to which site needs are met; and (3) the degree to which the assistance team's agenda is moving along. In considering the usefulness of events in Oakland during the entry process, this paper considers only the team's agenda, because the information exchange process upon which the successful completion of the linkage process depends was not far enough along to yield significant results at such an early point in the total assistance process, and because the need to negotiate an agreement about the terms of the team's working at the site dominates the entry stage. The entry process, however, does meet site needs to the extent that it increases the site participants' understanding of what the team has to offer in terms of their organizational development skills.

The entry activities at the district level were useful in meeting and moving forward the Eugene/Oakland team's agenda in the following ways: The activities as a whole enhanced the team's reputation at the local school level. They provided opportunities to know people across the district, opening channels for possible entry at the local school level, especially through principals and assistant principals who participated in district level events in which the team had an assistance role. The contacts made during district level entry provided channels of access back to district level knowledge and resources which were useful after the team began working at the local level.

The entry activities at the local school level were useful in meeting and moving forward the team's agenda by beginning some necessary processes:

- Communicating information about the team.
- Understanding the site context and needs.
- Negotiating the roles and expectations of both parties.
- Beginning relationships with site participants which would influence the impact of the assistance effort.
- Trying out team roles and ideas.
- Identifying information gaps, refining roles and goals, and reassessing and redefining the team agenda.

During the entry stage at the Greenwood Elementary School, the initial entry activity with the staff had two parts. The first meeting combined a presentation by the team with small group discussions to consider how the assistance team could help meet school needs. In the course of the meeting the assistance team was sharply questioned by some of the teachers. In the feedback session, which was held three weeks later, two team members presented the whole team's consolidation of the needs expressed by site participants in small groups during the earlier session. In reporting back, the team identified as the two most important needs: (1) to improve communication among faculty members, and (2) to get greater parent involvement. The Study Team Field Researcher reported that the level of tension on the part of the assistance team and a combination of sharp questioning and indifference on the part of the teachers toward the assisters was even greater at this second meeting. While it is the Study Team's perspective that the team gained some useful information about all of the local level entry processes already mentioned from this, its first attempt to begin entry at the local school level, this example has been chosen because it also illuminates that the timing of feedback is key in assistance work.

While most of the discussion in this section on establishing entry has dealt with the initial stage of establishing entry at the district or local school level, entry is an ongoing process which can resurface as an area of concern at any time in the overall assistance process. Entry questions asked, either by site participants or the assistance team, which arise after the entry stage may also be questions about usefulness.

Providing Assistance

Before proceeding with the frame by frame analysis of the assistance offered by the Eugene/Oakland Region, the major assistance activities at the district level and at the three local schools, which are within the scope of this paper, will be described.

District Level While most of the team's district-wide activities, in the form of participation in planning sessions and workshops, can be considered as part of the overall entry process to the local school level (the specific target of DTA technical assistance) some assistance activity continued at the district-wide level after the team began entry and assistance work at the local level.

The assistance team participated in two district-wide, two-day retreats. The first was held in mid-October and attended by Bettye, an Oakland-based assister, and the Study Team field researcher. The second, in mid-March, was attended by Richard, a Eugene-based Team member, who made a brief presentation, and the Study Team field researcher. Both retreats were part of a district effort to share information about the approach introduced by the Superintendent. They offered participants an opportunity to talk about activities that had begun since the last district-wide meeting. Through these events the team, by contributing to the overall sharing of information and planning for district activities, was able to collaborate at a district-wide level.

The Eugene/Oakland Region Director also participated in a series of meetings which began in December 1976, the purpose of which was to bring together the outside consultants associated with the Oakland School District. The group, acting as a high-powered brainstorming group under the direction of the person directly responsible to the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, was given the task of developing a systematic approach to staff development.

Five members of the Eugene/Oakland Team also continued to assist with a series of planning meetings and seminars which focused on the roles of the district's assistant principals, and later in the school year began assistance toward building management teams at the junior high level.

Greenwood School When the assistance work began, Jane and Richard, Eugene-based team members, were the co-conveners of a subproject to design and carry out a data feedback intervention with an elementary school School Instructional Strategies Council (SISC). Both Greenwood and Hazelwood elementary schools fell under this task. Bettye was the Oakland-based team member who began assisting them in early October.

Despite the evidence of difficulty between the staff and assistance team members in the Greenwood School situation, Jane, Richard, Warren (a Eugene-based team member), and Bettye returned in the fall to begin to provide assistance. A special workshop on parental involvement was set up for September 20 to which team members brought suggestions about ways in which parents could be involved with the school. Several of the items presented to the Greenwood staff were examples drawn directly from the nine sites data of how parents were involved. These were presented in the form of short vignettes prepared by Jane. Some staff members reported that the workshop was the first time some staff members had interacted with one another since a serious fight broke out among the teachers in the spring. The Study Team field researcher was told that this conflict was an expression of the continued ethnic tensions in the school, particularly conflicts between the Chicano and Black students and the teachers.

In mid-November the principal asked Bettye to arrange a workshop on the teaching of mathematics involving math "manipulatives," to be held at an already scheduled time on November 22. Bettye called Jane in Eugene, and they decided they would go ahead and give the workshop, even though there was little planning time.

Jane, Dick, the Team Leader, and Bettye arrived ten minutes late, having just come from a workshop for Greenwood parents and the School Advisory Committee on creating agenda, establishing group agreements, insuring group participation and making decisions so as to insure the group's commitment to action. The three began the math workshop with the seven teachers whom the principal had requested to attend. The team explained that their presence was in response to teacher interest in DTA services concerning parental involvement, staff development, and the SISC. The group then was told that they would develop a book on math strategies at this meeting. They were asked to participate in an exercise which was to be a part of the process of developing the booklet. Dick asked the teachers to write out a sentence completion to "The hardest thing about teaching math to intermediate kids is ________________________________." The teachers complied, producing items such as "teaching of foundation facts, comprehensive facts," "get them to be attentive and cooperate," "some kids don't understand word problems." The team then produced ditto masters on which the teachers were each asked to write a page discussing how they were coping with one of the specific problems that emerged from the sentence completion task. At that point, one of the teachers asked about the purpose of the meeting, explaining that the teachers had been informed that the workshop was to be on teaching "math manipulatives". In the ensuing discussion the disparity between the team's and the teachers' conceptions of team roles and expected expertise became apparent. The team explained that they were not present to provide specific help with instructional methods. Teachers were not interested in the brainstorming that the team was attempting to lead. The teachers also indicated that they did not choose to attend the workshop. The math resource teacher who was present attempted to describe the available materials which were in the math resource room. The workshop lasted less than an hour.

The math workshop was the last assistance event at Greenwood School, although the team did have some further contact with the principal and four of the teachers. In January the team suggested that the principal and three of the teachers might be hired as consultants to read early drafts of six of the nine sites case studies and to explore them for information that could be useful to their school. This consultation was initiated by Warren (Eugene-based team member) and Janis (Oakland-based assister) on January 21, during a meeting where Janis was introduced to the principal. During a meeting on January 28 with the principal, the consultation plan was arranged. It was carried out in March at which time the overall opinion of the four consultants from Greenwood was that there was very little in the drafts of six of the nine sites case studies that could be usefully applied to their own situations.

Garden Grove When the assistance work began, Warren and Richard were the co-conveners of the subproject to design and carry out training for parent involvement in an elementary school. Bettye was the Oakland-based team member who joined the team in early October, and became the co-convener along with Dick for this subproject. On January 17, the two replaced Warren and Richard, who became co-conveners of another subproject in the same reorganization of co-convener responsibility.

The original goal of the assistance work at Garden Grove, agreed upon by both the principal and the assistance team, was to increase the involvement of parents in the school, with the attendant expectation of greater collaboration between parents and teachers. Following informal interviews with Garden Grove teachers in the spring and some work with Garden Grove's SISC at the district-wide Summer Institute, plans were tentatively formulated at a planning meeting held on October 8 with two teachers and two parents. These plans included:

- Christmas workshops in which parents would make decorations for the school.
- Various plans for recruiting parents into school activities, such as home visitation meetings and individual phone calls.
- The development of a School Within a School for adult education, to begin in the spring.

Other school needs with which the assistance team might become involved were identified, including staff development, team building, a time management system, training of instructional assistants, and communication between groups of teachers organized around different grade levels.

Four days later the team made a presentation to the Garden Grove faculty, staff and parents on the proposed team activities at the site. Plans were presented for a series of five Christmas decorating workshops, designed to involve parents on an informal basis. Other ideas were presented for consideration, including parent effectiveness training, organizing parents to build playground equipment, time management systems, training for instructional aides, levels of communication within the school community, teacher home visitations, and a proposed staff-parent retreat. While the involvement of teachers and parents in some review of the planning process through this meeting resulted from the principal's intention to draw in the entire faculty to review plans, a vote was not taken to give faculty sanction to the team's presence at the site. The wide range of opinions expressed concerning the variety of activities was not consolidated at this meeting into a clear consensus about which types and forms of activities would be favored by the faculty. One teacher commented that:

> DTA has to have more meetings with teachers; make plans with the total faculty around where you want to go. . . A lot of teachers say we didn't have an opportunity to participate in the planning. . .people want a say in everything. . .heard people say, 'We were told we'd vote on them -- when did we vote?'

At the suggestion of a parent home visitations were planned in the late fall, in order for teachers and parents to become better acquainted and to solicit support for school instructional activities. While neither the assistance team nor the principal were involved in the decision to carry out this project, the assistance team joined with the parent volunteer and began to schedule home visits for the month of November. The meetings during the month were poorly attended, with the parent volunteer, the assistance team representatives, and the Study Team field researcher being the only ones to attend on a regular basis. Explanations offered at one minimally attended visit included: "Teachers don't invite parents to their homes or to school, so why should we?" and "Some parents don't want to invite strangers to their homes, so they don't come out." After the holiday break there were no follow-up discussions of the home visit project.

The Oakland-based assister undertook the major responsibility for organizing the workshops planned for parents to make Christmas decorations for doors and classrooms in the school. She arranged for the necessary materials and secured a volunteer teacher from the Oakland Recreational Department to run the decoration-making session. She obtained a mailing list of parents from the school's community liaison person and sent letters to parents, which were followed up by telephone calls. While the first of the five workshops, which began in mid-October and extended through the end of November, was attended by about forty parents, many of whom were parents of pre-school children who had come to the school for another meeting and were drawn into the workshop but did not return to the later workshops, the turnout declined in later meetings. Since some of the decorations planned depended on continuing attendance, and the attendance declined, the Oakland-based assister and the school's community liaison person finished some of the projects by themselves. The original workshop idea and the organization and implementation of the workshops did not involve input from the parents at any stage, beyond assembling specified decorations from materials on hand.

The planned overnight retreat became, after teacher response to the idea, an all-day workshop which was held on February 26. Approximately twenty parents attended, and almost as many teachers. Four teachers, four parents, the principal and the Oakland-based assister planned the event. A major part of the event was a presentation by two representatives from a school in Chicago, not associated with DTA, who represented a successful parent-involved change effort. While the Eugene group and some teachers arrived, expecting the format to be largely devoted to small group discussions which would maximize exchanges between parents and teachers around Garden Grove issues, the actual program (outlined as follows) did not allow some participants to discuss issues in the depth that they had anticipated:

- Speeches by a former Garden Grove principal and a specialist in multi-cultural education.
- Brief (20 to 30 minute) small group discussions, chaired by Garden Grove teachers, to discuss the presentation on multi-cultural education.
- Lunch break.
- An exercise in non-verbal communication skills, led by the Eugene-based team members, and involving small parent-teacher groups.
- Presentation by the Chicago delegation.
- Brief small group discussions to consider the ideas and implications arising from the Chicago presentation.
- Reconvening of the entire group for a wrap-up session, including a brief announcement about the "School Within a School", by the principal.

Reactions to the event varied. Several parents expressed feelings of approval for the information presented and said they had learned a lot. They were impressed with the information from the Chicago school and had enjoyed the day. Several others expressed disappointment with parental turnout, wondered how greater parental turnout could be brought about, and expressed frustration in feeling that there were no clear directions or guidelines about "where things were going". They indicated the "School Within a School" idea was still vague and confusing for them. The teachers' reactions were also mixed. Several reported that they had enjoyed the day, were interested in the Chicago school presentation as well as the morning presentations. On the other hand, some teachers complained that the main intent of the workshop, to involve parents more in the school through sharing in interactions with teachers by participating actively in extended small group discussions, had been subverted. One teacher expressed the opinion that "most teachers still don't know what [the School Within a School] is all about."

The idea of a "School Within a School" had been brought to the attention of the assistance team by the principal in the late spring of 1976, when the team first discussed the possibility that it do major assistance work at the Garden Grove School. While the "School Within a School" had been conceived of as the culminating parental involvement activity of the school year, and had been targeted to begin in the spring, by the end of February essential planning remained to be done, and understanding of and support for the program was not widespread among the faculty and parents. The two-month leave in March and April of the Oakland-based assister, who was ill, coincided with little forward motion on the "SWAS" proposal. A small planning committee of parents did meet occasionally and the parents made an approach to the central office of the Oakland Public School System, asking for teachers for their planned education series. While the assistance team kept in touch with the school, the initiative for developing the planned courses for parents fell to the principal and four courses were set up to begin in early May. These were: (1) language arts, led by a reading specialist from the district; (2) elementary math, taught by a math resource person from the district; (3) cultural enrichment, coordinated by a Garden Grove parent and the Oakland-based assister; and (4) parent effectiveness training, taught on a shared basis by the school psychologist and a Eugene-based assister. Four parents attended the four parent effectiveness sessions. The language arts and cultural enrichment courses were each attended by approximately eight to ten parents.

At a later date (June) at the school site, the principal voiced the opinion that:

> If DTA had given us [the Oakland-based assister]. . .and left us alone. . .down here. . .we could have done all this ourselves. They didn't give us any other new ideas.

Hazelwood The Eugene/Oakland team's overall assistance aim at Hazelwood was the same as that at Greenwood, to provide data feedback intervention with an elementary school SISC. Parental participation aimed at increasing parental awareness of the school's instructional process was the primary target for the team's assistance work sought by the Hazelwood administrators. The team began to work with Hazelwood's SISC in the fall, and presented a slide show to the SISC on November 22, which dealt with the kinds of parental involvement at the nine sites.

A Christmas workshop for all Hazelwood parents to make decorations and discuss parent involvement at the school, to be designed and conducted by the assistance team and the Community Coordinator, fell through when only one parent responded to the invitations which had been sent home with the children. Two ideas emerged from a discussion of how to get more parents to come to the school, however, which were later used. The first of these was to use Room Parents to recruit other parents. The second was to arrange a visit to Hazelwood by some resource people from another school district.

Janis was hired as a half-time Oakland-based assister in January to assist and support Bettye in her role. When it soon became clear that her initially planned role would not work out, it was arranged that Janis would concentrate her work at the Hazelwood site.

As a result of a visit to a Chicago school (not one of the nine funded sites) in February by the assistance team, two participants from the Chicago school were invited to present their program to the faculty and parents of Garden Grove at that school's forthcoming parent-teacher conference, and also to make a visit to Hazelwood for a luncheon presentation. Janis believed that the Hazelwood parents would also benefit from talking informally with the two visitors and visiting Hazelwood would provide them with an opportunity to visit an Oakland school. It was arranged that the Chicago school people would visit Hazelwood the day before the luncheon to talk with parents and tour the school, returning March 1 to deliver their presentation during a parent-sponsored and organized luncheon. Thus the event was viewed as a means of involving parents in a significant school-related function, informing them of future school related activities, and bringing faculty and parents together to learn of a successful school program in which parents were actively involved, which might be transferable to Hazelwood.

A small, but enthusiastic and vocal, group of parents with whom Janis had been working, drawn from the existing Room Parents and dubbed the "Parents' Brigade" by the assistance team, assumed responsibility for planning the meal and confirming parent attendance. All participants agreed that the pre-luncheon visit and tour effectively set the stage for a more comfortable presentation the following day.

Fifty to sixty parents and almost all staff members attended the presentation. The visitors were introduced and discussed the origins, purposes, and organization of their parent group and provided an extensive array of materials and literature depicting their school program. Hazelwood parents and teachers alike were enthusiastic about the program and its possibilities at Hazelwood. After the presentation, lunch was served, a decoratively arranged meal consisting of individual dishes prepared by parents who had been contacted by the Parents' Brigade, some of whom were unable to attend the event itself. The luncheon was considered a major success by the principal, the assistance team, parents and faculty, and later plans for a Hazelwood based "Operation Excellence" arose from the presentation by the Chicago school.

The enthusiasm generated by the Chicago school visit led to intensive planning by the core group of parents who had been active in planning the luncheon. After sorting through a series of suggestions, including a flea market and May Day celebration, they decided that their next major effort would be to organize a fashion show. This event was intended to generate further parent involvement. On the other hand, the principal expressed the view that it was a deviation of parent interest away from fundamental instructional issues and the "real business" of the school.

The Oakland-based assister found herself caught in the middle. While the parents were exercising some muscle in planning the fashion show, seeking assistance from teachers who traditionally had organized this event, the principal was concerned that the parents should be more involved in instructional and school related activities. Janis found herself in the somewhat uncomfortable role of communicator and translator between the parents and the principal, acting as spokesperson for the parents to the principal and as messenger from the principal to the parents. She was caught between being viewed as an advocate for parents and being a facilitator guiding parents in activities condoned by the principal. In any event, the fashion show was scheduled for and carried out in mid-spring. Parents, teachers and students were models and the event was well attended and received.

Around this time, the Eugene-based assisters working at Hazelwood suggested expanding the already active parent group into a Parent-Teacher Task Force which could make decisions about plans for the fall and how to use DTA more effectively. Richard arranged a conference with the principal, planning parental involvement in the life of the school. The augmented planning group, chaired by a Eugene-based assister, met to identify concerns, which included a desire to build trust and rapport between parents and teachers, and the development of a self-sustaining, year round, action oriented program which would involve parents and teachers and emphasize the content of instruction being taught at Hazelwood. The planning group agreed that a fall retreat along the lines of the Garden Grove retreat would enable the Hazelwood School community to accomplish its objectives. Having agreed upon these general objectives, the group divided into two committees, one concerned with logistics and one with recruitment of parents for the retreat and subsequent involvement in the program which was to be developed from it. Richard offered the services of DTA in designing the content of the retreat around the agreements reached by the planning group. Some concern was expressed about the implications of planning without the direct involvement of the intended participants, and also that the planned retreat would take place off site, limiting the ability of Hazelwood parents and staff to gain a sense of ownership of the entire process. By the end of the school year plans had been formalized as to the date and site of the retreat (on the Hazelwood campus). The subcommittees agreed to meet during the summer with Janis and continue planning recruitment strategies.

Exchanging Information

The beginning of providing assistance at the local school level coincided with a change in the pattern of information exchange within the assistance team itself. The earlier pattern had involved more broadly interactive sharing of information and planning for district-wide activities. As a result of shifting toward more specialization in defining and carrying out roles to provide assistance at different local schools, the various team members became more knowledgeable about different aspects of the schools.

The Eugene-based team members' primary focus in the information exchange process was that between the team and a small core group of participants which included the principal. The Oakland-based assisters, being on their own and around the sites more frequently, exchanged information with a wider range of site participants over a wider range of topics.

The kinds of information exchange that the Eugene-based team members initiated with site participants were mainly factual and theoretical. The Oakland-based assisters' exchanges with site participants involved, in addition to the above, more lore, the sharing of more information around such experiences as childrearing, happenings around the school, and happenings in the community.

Distinguishing Roles

Within the team structure individuals became and were expected by the team, to be the specialized sources of detailed factual and experience-based information about the particular sites and aspects of sites on which their work focused. While the assisters remained intermediaries for important decisions between site participants and the assistance team as a whole, they were able, and sometimes had to take more discretionary power to make decisions, in comparison with their work at the district-wide level. As the different assisters became more involved in specific schools, they assumed more power to decide where and how to match the team's resources with site needs. From the Study Team perspective, however, the Eugene-based assisters who acted in intermediary roles were able to exercise more discretionary decision making power, speaking for the team as a whole, than were the Oakland-based assisters.

Because the planned two-day orientation sessions first for Connie, and then for Bettye and Janis together, had to be restructured around other necessary work, and no further orientation sessions were planned, the three Oakland-based assisters independently gained most of their understanding about the team, their roles, DTA, as well as procedures for carrying out long distance communication, while also learning about the sites, implementing their roles, and carrying out assistance. Bettye and Janis developed somewhat different roles in somewhat different schools, with principals who had two different styles.

Building Relationships

The primary relationships through which the Eugene/Oakland team designed its assistance work were those that existed between team members and the principals. In each local school under consideration here, entry began with the principal and the terms of providing assistance were negotiated primarily with the principals who remained the focal points in the ongoing exchanges of information.

The Eugene-based part of the assistance team had emphasized and developed close working relationships with each other, including considerable team collaboration and mutual support. Bettye and Janis were not fully brought into the Eugene relationship network. Two conditions which affected the difficulty of including them were the need of the Eugene-based assisters to commute from Oregon while developing and maintaining several different assistance efforts in Oakland, and the separation and concentration of Bettye's and Janis's efforts in schools several miles apart.

Several factors came together in shaping the relationship between Bettye and the principal of Garden Grove. They already had a common experience base as a result of having been members of the same church. Bettye entered her assistance role in the context of the team's previous negotiations with the principal. Furthermore, Bettye was isolated, to some extent, from the other team members. The relationship that developed between Bettye and the principal became not only one that included considerable informal sharing of information, but also encouraged mutual support.

Janis entered the project later, without having any previous history with the principal of Hazelwood. When she entered, the planning for a major parent involvement event was underway. She found herself building relationships by supporting both the principal and a group of involved parents who had divergent views on some issues.

Identifying and Making Links

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that developing and carrying out assistance activities around links between nine sites information and assistance site needs was difficult to do. At least the Study Team did not observe many linkage activities in carrying out its field observation of the Eugene/Oakland Region.* It appears that not many efforts to link nine sites information with site needs were carried through to include specific components of assistance activities.

The most important and effective linkage activity, judging from the enthusiastic reactions of all the groups involved, was the visit of the Chicago school participants, especially to Hazelwood School but also to the Garden Grove retreat. This was an effective linkage activity with a group outside the DTA network. The group used materials, such as sample handouts for parents, as well as their actual presence to help make the existence of parental involvement activities at the Chicago School concrete and accessible to their audience. Initially the team suggested that a consultant from the Los Diablos site could be brought in. The Garden Grove principal suggested that participants from the Chicago school might better be able to meet Garden Grove needs.

The Eugene/Oakland Region used pictures, slides and vignettes of the nine sites to support the assistance process at all of the schools. Another linkage event carried out by the team was the reading of and the reaction to the nine sites case studies by the principal of Greenwood and three teachers.

Another category of linkage events is introduced here because it appeared during the process of assistance. This was linkage events initiated by the New York Region of the DTA Project. One instance was the visit of the Hazelwood principal to a New York seminar on May 25, 1977, on "The Principal, Key Decision Maker in School Problem Solving." In response to a request from the New York Region that an Oakland principal attend the seminar, the Region selected the Hazelwood principal who attended as one of eleven principals or their representatives from both NIE funded and assistance sites. Arrangements were carried out through Janis, who attended the seminar as one of eighteen DTA staff representatives. The principal said the visit was enlightening, especially the time spent in the New York NIE funded schools. She also said it was good to talk with the other principals, to share ideas and issues.

---

*The Study Team, partly because of geography and partly because of the internal structure of the Eugene-based part of the team, was not in a position to gather much information about how the Eugene-based group functioned as a team. For instance, within the Eugene group importance was placed on sharing all roles, which made it difficult for the team to accept the kind of internal documenter role desired by the Study Team to support its data collection. This role would isolate somewhat the individual filling it from the rest of the team and was discontinued by the second phase of this project. The Study Team was able to observe only a few (and those only in Oakland) of the frequent team meetings and therefore could not observe linkage efforts which might have been reported or taken place in them.

Another linkage effort initiated by the New York Region was a tape describing in detail a "parents' room" at a New York site, which was prepared and sent to Bettye by one of the New York site researchers. Apparently the tape was never used and was lost.

Using Materials

The Eugene/Oakland team used materials for a number of purposes and from a number of sources to support its assistance work. Some of the materials were used to introduce and help make concrete to site participants, ideas and groups concerned with issues and problems which assistance site participants were identifying. The Region used pictures, slides and written descriptions, especially during entry, to provide information about the NIE funded sites. For instance, the short vignettes developed by Jane attempted to recreate for site participants the feelings and issues which had been experienced at the network sites, especially as concerned parent participation. Slides also were used to make presentations more interesting and exciting, as well as, to provide direct visual links between the funded sites and the assistance sites. The commentary accompanying slide presentations often used catchy phrases and had a light or humorous tone.

Materials, especially in written form, were used to support or to introduce information the team had developed from its previous experience; for instance, on such topics as team building, minute keeping and brainstorming. In distributing materials at the district level during the series of meetings and seminars with which the team was involved during the entry stage, team members also gave participants notebooks to keep the materials in, and urged that the notebooks be updated by including new materials that would be handed out in future sessions.

Materials were used by the team to supplement the gathering of information. The team developed questionnaires and asked for written feedback responses to get reactions to key events and to obtain information during workshops that would be helpful to the team later in the assistance process. One technique the team used at Garden Grove was to hand out blank maps of the Oakland area to teachers, asking them to draw in their portrayals of the school's attendance area, to indicate their "mental maps" of the school community.

Materials sometimes were used to support the development and recognition of problem solving capacity. For instance, when the teachers at Greenwood contributed toward a handbook on teaching math, it was intended as a compilation in written form of what they already knew about the teaching of math and a way of sharing with each other their different perspectives and knowledge about the teaching of math.

Checking for Usefulness

The Study Team's limited access to what went on at team meetings occurring in Eugene narrows the extent to which we can describe how the team checked for usefulness.

The team conducted formal usefulness checks with site participants through the use of feedback sessions after some assistance events, brief questionnaires and written feedback, and some telephone conversations. The team carried out more informal usefulness checks through informal interviews with site participants and through time, usually at the end, built into most assistance events including meetings, for sharing with the whole group individual reactions to what had occurred during the event.

The Oakland-based assisters, spending considerably more time at the local school sites, received more extensive, more varied and sometimes more critical reactions from site participants to the team's work. Consequently, much of the informal information coming from site participants about the usefulness of the team's activities, had to be channeled through the Oakland-based assisters to the Eugene-based assisters.

In considering how the team demonstrated learning from experience in the process of carrying out sustained assistance at the local school level, the circumstance of the team conducting certain major assistance activities simultaneously rather than sequentially made it more difficult to ascertain what the team learned about the usefulness of those activities. For instance, scheduling Christmas decorating workshops at two local schools in the same period of time, and the use of resource people from outside schools involved bringing in the same two people from one Chicago school to two different Oakland local school sites (Hazelwood and Garden

Grove) within a two-day period of time. On the other hand, the Garden Grove parent involvement retreat did lead to the planning of a similar retreat to involve greater parent participation for Hazelwood.

The pattern of similar types of events or formats being used repeatedly suggests that the team considered these types of events or formats to be useful. For instance, a similar entry presentation format was used at each local site. The team focused its work through the principal and tried to involve the SISC significantly at each site. And the team repeatedly used a workshop format.

The team's usefulness questions, when asked, focused primarily on the needs of the team's agenda rather than on DTA purposes or site needs in themselves. There was little evidence of the direct use of the nine sites information in providing assistance, although there was considerable emphasis on organizational communication and processes as aspects of problem solving capacity where these fit in with the team's organizational development perspective. Usefulness to site needs was considered mainly in the light of those needs which either fell under the scope of the team's previously identified tasks or its recognition of its own areas of expertise. Activities were selected and evaluated more according to how they could move along the kinds and forms of processes emphasized by the team theme of organizational development and less according to how they might provide specific content or develop specific skills which fell outside the team theme. How the team asked usefulness questions based on the needs of its organizational support base and long range plans would be an area of loose speculation for the Study Team, and so we do not address it, although we recognize that it was a necessary part of its usefulness checking.

Withdrawal from Assistance

The Study Team refers to complete withdrawal as the point at which the contract between the assistance team and the assistance site comes to an end. The contract or agreement may have been written or oral, precise or inexact. While complete withdrawal had not happened at any of the Oakland sites under consideration in this paper at the time of its writing, either the movement toward withdrawal, or withdrawal from some significant aspect of the initially agreed upon scope of the work had taken place at the Greenwood site and at the district-wide level.

Clear agreement on the scope of the Region's work at Greenwood was never reached between the Eugene/Oakland team and the school, partly because the team wanted to work primarily with and through the SISC and the principal saw the team's potential usefulness as not through that body which she considered to be already working adequately. After this conflict had become clear, however, the team continued to work at the school through the unsuccessful November 22 workshop on math manipulatives. After that event the team virtually ceased assistance activities at Greenwood, although occasional contacts were maintained, including the solicitation of responses to the nine sites case studies.

The nature and scope of the Eugene/Oakland team's assistance at the district-wide level changed significantly at the point, approximately at the beginning of the 1976-77 school year, when the team began to work primarily at the local school level. The team began to spend less time at the district-wide level, as it was spending proportionately more at the local level. Around this time the assisters became less broadly involved with the district-wide Technical Task Teams, focusing mainly on work with the assistant principals to the extent that they continued to work at the district-wide level. As a result they also became less involved in the overall planning of district-wide activities.

An additional important change centered around the role of the Oakland-based member of the team. Connie had worked closely with the Director of Curriculum and Instruction, who also was Co-Chair of the Instructional Strategy Council, and who had been the team's most important contact at the district-wide level. She had had previous experience working with a district-wide program prior to DTA, so her skills fit right into the team's work on that level, and she had spent most of her time while a member of the Eugene/Oakland team, between mid-February and August, working at the district-wide level. The Co-Chair had viewed Connie's work as contributing to the district-wide level effort he was involved with, so he was unsure, when it became apparent that a shift was occurring, whether, and to what extent, the new Oakland-based assister would continue to do some of the things that Connie had done. For instance, the role of writing and editing the district-wide newsletter that Connie had filled remained open after she left.

The Co-Chair began to question the mutual relationship that the Eugene/Oakland team and he had deveveloped, having thought it was one which would have encouraged the team to be open with him and solicit his involvement in their plans for shifting emphasis to the local level. He reported to the Study Team Director that he, to some extent, felt that DTA had moved almost behind his back to negotiate entry at the local level. He did not know how the decision was made to work in certain schools, even though he knew that the principals identified had volunteered; he had some other ideas about schools he would have liked to see DTA work with, and he had the responsibility of reporting that kind of activity to the Area Superintendents. In addition, the team had not talked with him about how the activities they had been involved with on the district-wide level would be influenced as a result of their spending more time at the local school level. The person who replaced Connie was viewed by the team as someone who would be working primarily at the local school level. The Co-Chair expressed the veiw that the issue of defining Bettye's role should have been discussed further with him, and not just assumed by the team.

While the primary relationship between the Co-Chair and the Eugene/Oakland team had been with the Director of the assistance region, the Co-Chair let Dick, the Director, know his displeasure with the apparent withdrawal from what he understood to be the terms of that relationship by putting pressure on Bettye. While some of his displeasure was about how the team's shift to a local school emphasis actually took place, and its implications for the kind of relationship he believed had been established, the Co-Chair also was concerned because his conception of the team's potential for impact differed from that of the DTA focus. He considered that the district-wide efforts gave DTA more potential for affecting more schools in Oakland and thus for having a greater total impact.

In considering the process of withdrawal through the six frames, a question format has been chosen for three reasons: (1) the Study Team was not in a position comprehensively to observe and analyze the steps of the partial withdrawal at the district-wide level or to assess the long or short range impact of the team's work there on local capacity for problem solving; (2) neither complete withdrawal nor clear movement toward complete withdrawal had occurred at any of the Oakland assistance sites at the time of the writing of this paper; and (3) the Study Team considered that the question format would provide useful tools for both performing and analyzing future withdrawals..

Exchanging Information

1. What understandings were established at the time of entry about the timing and conditions of the assistance team's termination of regular assistance at the site?

2. What steps of withdrawal are used, and how are they planned, and are they communicated clearly?

3. What has the assistance site learned as a result of working at the site?

4. What have site participants learned during the time of the assistance team's presence at the site?

    a. What kinds of access, direct and indirect, do site participants now have to the nine sites documentary and face to face information sources?

    b. What other sources of information have they learned how to use?

    c. What new questions do site participants now use in working to solve problems?

    d. How have different information channels opened between different groups in the school and with the larger school community during the assistance process?

5. Is it useful to the assistance team, site participants, or district level personnel to keep some information channels open with the assistance team after their withdrawal?

Distinguishing Roles

1. Who initiated the withdrawal?

2. Have withdrawal and the terms of withdrawal been mutually agreed upon by the two parties?

3. How are existing assistance team roles used more, less, or differently during withdrawal?

4. Who handles withdrawal?

5. How did the team members' roles change during the assistance process?

6. What new roles have emerged or changed in the schools during the time of the assistance process?

7. Does the assistance team or its individual members maintain any kind of active role with site participants after withdrawal has been completed?

Building Relationships

1. During the withdrawal process what parts of the relationships which have been developed are to be maintained and what parts are to be maintained and what parts are to be relinquished?

2. During the time of the assistance work what relationsips in the school setting have significantly changed? Between parents and teachers, between parents and administrators, between teachers and administrators, between students and school staff, between school participants and district level personnel? Within groups?

3. What new relationships exist with the nine sites or other schools as a result of the assistance work?

4. What relationships, that have developed with the site participants being assisted, can or do carry over to future assistance activities?

5. What relationships with people in other parts of the district, or at the district-wide level, have been influenced by the assistance effort?

6. What values and interpretations are assumed by both parties in reflecting on relationships between them? To what extent is there difference or agreement between the parties on these values and interpretations?

7. What are the terms or conditions that could enhance or restrict the possibility of the team returning?

8. How did the existence of the Study Team influence the carrying out of the assistance work?

Identifying and Making Links

1. What has the assistance team learned from outside sources, including DTA sources, about carrying out withdrawal? (For instance, timing, structure, lessons from negative experience.)

2. What links or channels of information are closed to the school community as a result of withdrawal?

3. What links, both documentary and face to face, are still operating after withdrawal?

4. What links have been established? Used? Which ones are ongoing?

5. How have site participants clarified their needs during the time the assistance was in progress?

6. Who and how many people did significant linkage? Are they staying or going?

7. Was the linkage primarily with human resources or with material resources, or equally shared?

8. To what extent were information linkages made with fact, theory, and/or lore? What kinds of combinations?

9. To what extent and in what ways did information flow from the assistance site to other school communities and people during the linkage process?

10. To what extent did specific linkages serve to obtain information that could be used directly? That had to be or was adapted for use at the assistance site?

Using Materials

1. What materials were used or created in the withdrawal stage?

2. What materials were used to move toward or formalize withdrawal?

3. How did the use of materials change throughout the assistance process, including withdrawal?

4. What access to useful material sources have site participants developed or maintained during the assistance process?

5. What materials have site participants developed on their own during the assistance process?

6. What materials have been developed by the assistance team during the assistance process?

7. What materials have site participants and the assistance team developed together during the assistance process?

8. What patterns can be traced about how, why and when materials were used in the assistance process?

9. Who used materials? How much? When? Where? Why? How?

Checking for Usefulness

1. How and to what extent was the assistance work evaluated, including its direct and indirect usefulness?

2. Who did the checking? the assistance team, site participants? What groups or individuals?

3. How often did checking for usefulness take place? When?

4. What stimulated the checking at the points where it occurred? Was it preplanned or spontaneous?

5. Were there times when usefulness should have been checked and was not?

6. What criteria of usefulness were used? Were the criteria explicit or implicit?

7. What techniques, structures, and processes were developed for checking usefulness? Where were they used? When? Involving what participants?

8. How useful were the information exchange structures and processes that were developed and/or used?

9. How useful were the kinds of roles that were developed?

10. How useful were the relationships that developed?

11. How useful were the efforts to identify links?

12. How useful were the materials that were used?

13. How useful was the assistance work to the students?

14. How useful are these kinds of questions to technical assisters?

These questions conclude this chapter which has ecamined, using six frames, the school assistance work in Oakland of a team whose style is based on a theme of "organizational theme." The next chapter examines similarly the work of another assistance team within the DTA Project, a team with another theme and consequent style.

CHAPTER III: THE STYLE OF THE CHICAGO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REGION

Organization of the Team

Exchanging Information

The Chicago Region team, like the Eugene/Oakland team, emphasized sharing as much information as possible within the team, with the understanding that everybody on the team could not equally know all aspects of the work. While the necessity of sharing some kinds of information within the team was recognized, the decision about when to share, when not to share, or when to seek the input of others on specific kinds of information fell largely on the individuals who were recognized as having primary access to the different kinds of information (i.e., information about parents, teachers, administrators, linkage). While individuals had this kind of discretionary responsibility, the process of deciding what and how information was to be shared often involved input from the Region Director.

The Chicago Region team, unlike the Eugene/Oakland team, was assembled as a working group immediately preceding and during the early stages of the assistance process under discussion in this paper. Therefore the team's information sharing patterns were established while the assistance process was beginning, rather than prior to the work. The team was organized both to test out and to develop ideas within the domain of the Region's organizing theme of building from cultural strengths with a sustained emphasis on asking how and to what extent the team's efforts were meeting the expressed needs of the school sites being served. This meant that staff members were selected who had previous experiences with building from cultural strengths from the Black perspective in Chicago educational settings. Team members were encouraged to share those experiences with each other.

Both informal and formal, primarily face to face but also documentary, information exchanges between the Chicago team and other CNS based DTA staff were frequent for every Chicago Region team member because the entire team was based in the same office with most other DTA staff members. While the Region Director mediated some information from the Project Director and Leadership Team, and the TA Doc Linker mediated some information from the Documentation Team, every team member had opportunities for face to face exchanges with all other Chicago-based DTA staff, as well as with DTA staff based in other cities when they visited the Chicago office.

The Chicago team was organized to meet regularly every week. The weekly whole-team meetings, which lasted throughout the assistance process usually included: (1) updating on activities in the field and linkage; (2) sharing appropriate information regarding the team's organizational support base; (3) discussing issues about how the team was functioning; and (4) planning and evaluating activities in the field. The two team members who spent the most time at the assistance sites, met frequently to plan and coordinate their specific activities. The TA-Doc Linker often joined these meetings.

Distinguishing Roles

The Chicago team structure was designed to assign clear areas of authority and responsibility to each team member, with the Region Director having the overall responsibility to the Project Director for the work of the team.

The Region Director, as the most experienced member of the Chicago Team, took a key role in designing and carrying out entry at the District and local school levels, designing team roles and selecting staff, and shaping and reshaping the region's overall work around its organizing theme of building from cultural strengths. Her role also was designed to provide some assistance within District 21.

The TA-Doc Linker, Yvonne, unlike the other team members except Barbara (a technical assistance specialist), was actively involved in the planning of the assistance work from the beginning. Like the other team members, she was expected to participate fully as a team member, actively supporting the work of the team as a whole and in its parts. Her exclusive area of overall responsibility was to familiarize herself as completely as possible with both the nine sites data and the assistance sites, both to identify potentially useful links and to respond to linkage needs identified by other team members, and to stimulate and lead other team members to use nine sites information to address assistance site needs. (For further discussion of this role see Holmes, 1977b; for a fuller discussion of the information utilization work of the TA-Doc Linker see King, 1977.)

The two Technical Assistance Specialists (Barbara and Carl) were responsible for providing direct assistance to teachers, parents, and administrators in District 21, concentrating primarily at Reel School.

The Analyst Developer role (Ilena) was initially designed to cover two functions. The first was documenting and feeding back information about the activities of the team internally and in the field, to assist the team in reflecting on, refining, and when necessary altering assistance strategies and activities. The second was developing media products for the team to use in the field, some of which also would be used to describe the DTA Project and the Chicago Region team.

The Administrative Assistant (Sylvia) for the team was responsible for providing administrative support to the whole team; the majority of her time was spent providing direct support to the Region Director.

One of the results of having a structure where appropriate authority supports assigned responsibility, is to clarify where power exists within that structure. In a team setting where overall goals and objectives are clear and shared by individual team members, power becomes the primary tool for influencing how the team moves toward carrying out its goals. In the case of the Chicago Region, areas of responsibility were clearly defined. Much of the authority remained with the Region Director, whose own authority was somewhat ambiguous at the time of beginning the work because authority and responsibility were being redefined throughout the organizational support base.

In order to maximize the potential of each individual role, individual team members, including the Region Director, attempted to clarify the limits or potential of their formal and informal authority within the team, bringing it into closer accord with their formal responsibilities, by raising questions about the areas of overlap between the formal roles, by laying out individual skills and experience bases in such a way that commanded the respect of the other team members, and demonstrating access to powerful information sources.*

---

*Discussion about authority and responsibility is included in the Chicago section and not paralleled in the Eugene/Oakland section because (1) it was openly recognized as an issue within the Chicago Region itself, and (2) the Study Team was invited to and did sit in on most of the weekly Chicago Region meetings where the issue was sometimes discussed, thereby gaining an extensive data base from which to consider this and some other issues related to providing assistance in teams to local schools.

Building Relationships

Two circumstances relating to how the Chicago Region was organized, contributed to its capacity to build and maintain meaningful working relationships to support its work. The first was the Region Director deliberately designed roles and selected staff so as to maximize the usefulness of individuals' previous background and experience. It was assumed that the selection of an all Black staff would support the development of credible relationships between Region staff and the predominantly Black district level and local school level participants. It also was considered appropriate for a Black staff to do the work of developing assistance strategies from the organizing theme of building on cultural strengths from the Black perspective. In addition, an effort was made to match the particular experience bases of individual team members with the work they would be doing so as to support the building of relationships from the point of view of each team role. The two Technical Assistance Specialists had both taught in Chicago Public Schools and knew Chicago public school teachers, administrators, parents, and students and also the Chicago public school context in and near District 21. One of the TA Specialists already had extensive experience working with parents of Chicago public school students. The TA-Doc Linker already had strong relationships with members of the DTA Documentation Team because of her previous work with that team and at CNS before DTA. The Analyst/Developer also had previous experience teaching in Chicago Public Schools. The Region Director, besides having twenty-three years of varied experience with the Chicago Public Schools including nineteen years of teaching, had developed sustained significant relationships with individuals at the District level. Thus the team was organized to maximize the usefulness of the previous experience of team members to support the building of relationships with site practitioners in the assistance work.

The second circumstance stemmed from the fact that both the Region staff and the site participants were Chicago-based. Living and working in the same city, the whole team could participate in assistance events where team participation was useful. In addition any individual team member could attend or praticipate in any event even on short notice, whether a planned assistance event or a special local school site event, and where attendance at that event might be viewed as important to building relationships, identifying links or gathering information to support relationships and the work as a whole. Assistance events could occur not only at the assistance sites, but also at the assistance team setting (CNS), or on neutral ground. Furthermore, since all team members lived in Chicago, they not only had easy access to each other but also had many opportunities to develop and maintain relationships with other Chicago-based (and visiting) DTA staff.

Identifying and Making Links

The Chicago Region developed out of the CNS setting where the effort to identify useful links between research and practice, and between different school sites had been an integral part of the organization's purpose from its beginning. (See Background Section, Chapter.) This tradition of linkage may be viewed as contributing to the Region's taking its linkage charge seriously.

Although the team was organized so that linking the nine sites information with technical assistance site needs was the primary responsibility of the TA-DOC Linker, it is the Study Team's view that other linkage perspectives were inherent in the overall needs of the Chicago Region's assistance situation. The components, or emphases, around linkage which emerged within the team during the assistance project were grounded in the reality of the team's complex assistance task. They also caused considerable difficulty in the team's functioning.

The first component was the nine sites information contained in both DTA documentary sources and in the experience and perspectives of members of the Documentation Team, including the site researchers, and the data coders. While the TA-Doc Linker viewed the linkage process as appropriately involving the whole team to some extent, she remained the primary gatekeeper of routes of access to the nine sites information.

The second component was the needs of the sites being served by the team. The two Technical Assistance Specialists became the primary sources of information about assistance site needs because they spent considerably more time at the local school level than other team members. While both TA Specialists were able to represent the points of view of site participants in identifying local school needs, Barbara, who preceded Carl on the job by seven months, became the primary voice within the team to insist that the local school perspective be considered in planning and carrying out activities.

The third component that has to be considered in identifying and using links between the nine sites information and site needs was the Region's overall agenda, including its organizing theme, and considerations regarding the reality of providing assistance at the local school level, such as the necessity of establishing and maintaining supportive relationships at the District level. As both the developer of the building from cultural strengths approach and the team's primary mover at the District level, the Region Director became the gatekeeper of the perspectives of the team theme and the District level relationships. A potential linkage activity which proposed to use nine sites information to help meet local school needs, but did not fall within the scope of the theme or which would cause difficulty at the District level, might be considered to be inappropriate or unwise for the Region to undertake.

The Region Director also had the role responsibility for keeping the various needs and purposes of the Region in balance. While she played an active role at times in supporting the considerations of nine sites information use and assistance site need, the organization of the team and demands of the work made it difficult for her fully to play the necessary balancing role. She was a major actor in the discussion because she was the essential gatekeeper for the building from cultural strengths perspective and the pragmatic needs at the District level. While the team might have functioned more effectively if the Region Director had not also been the primary guardian of certain of the essential parts of the work, it is difficult to see how she could have avoided having a certain amount of conflict between her overall role and the necessity to guard the perspectives and needs of the team theme and District level requirements. Despite the fact that at times during the work hard conflict erupted within the team over how best to meet the different needs of using the nine sites data, meeting local site needs, organizing team work from the perspective of its overall theme, and recognizing and meeting the reality of having to work through the school district, the four perspectives were conscientiously covered by the three primary gatekeepers of the team, allowing a chance, although sometimes through uncomfortable conflict, of achieving a balance between the different legitimate areas of need which had to be considered in designing and carrying out specific assistance activities.

Certain other circumstances enhanced the potential of the Region to make useful links. The broad range of experience in local school settings was viewed as a potential tool for identifying and screening links. The circumstance already mentioned of the assistance team and many other of the DTA staff, including Documentation Team members, working out of the same office maximized the opportunities for the team's rapid access both to documentary and face to face sources of information about the nine sites. There was also the potential for assistance site participants to have some direct access to project members working with the nine sites information.

The variety of opportunities for direct access by team members and site participants to the nine sites information sources limited the extent to which the TA-Doc Linker could take on an exclusively mediating role regarding the nine sites information. She also took deliberate steps to encourage and assist team members and sometimes site participants to have direct access to the nine sites information sources further limiting the extent of her mediation of information.

Using Materials

While some other team members, expecially the TA Specialists, were expected to contribute to the development of materials to be used at the assistance sites, a special role was created on the team to support and extend the development of materials. The Analyst/Developer was expected to spend half of her time on the development of materials, particularly descriptive material about the team, including videotapes and slide presentations.

A part of the TA-Doc Linker role was to identify and provide access to materials concerning the nine sites, including pictures, case studies, and materials resulting from computer inquiries. While the primary emphasis was on members of the team trying to use materials and information relating to the nine sites, materials could also be drawn from other sources if the materials from other sources seemed more useful for tailoring the team's efforts to match the needs of the assistance site and the team's agenda.

The Administrative Assistant maintained a filing system which included correspondence, notes on key planning meetings and phone calls, evaluations of assistance events, samples of materials handed out during assistance events, copies of written communications between team members, and communications between the team and the school district and/or other parts of the DTA project. The filing system was not as comprehensive as Eugene's in that it did not cross-index the information contained in the files.

Checking for Usefulness

Ilena as the assistance team Analyst/Developer was also the formal Study Team linkage person because her responsibility as analyst required her to observe the ongoing activities of the team in a manner similar to that used by the Study Team field researcher who was also observing the team at work. The analyst was expected to encourage the team to reflect on specific activities and to carry out data gathering activities to help the team evaluate selected activities in its regular weekly meetings and on certain other occasions.

While the TA-Doc Linker also insured that the team would ask usefulness questions regarding the use of the nine sites information in the assistance process, and the Region Director led the team in asking usefulness questions about all parts of the team's agenda, including its organizing theme and district level needs, the whole team continually asked questions in an effort to identify how and to what extent local school needs were being met through the assistance process. An important focus of district level usefulness questions was in terms of how useful different activities proved to be at the local school level.

Establishing Entry

Exchanging Information

The questions concerning entry which were laid out in the discussion of the Eugene/Oakland assistance process also apply to the Chicago Region. In both regions initial entry activities involved extensive exchanges of information about these questions, and in both regions the primary initiative for establishing entry was taken by the assistance team.

While the Chicago Region introduced and began extensively considering these entry questions during the entry stage, questions about site needs and site characteristics and how the team could support site strengths and address site needs continued to be asked throughout the assistance process. The team saw itself and site participants in a learning posture. The team actively sought knowledge from both district level and local school participants about what could work in their settings, what ideas and kinds of programs were viewed as having promise, and how participants' specific previous experience could shape or contribute to shaping the programs developing in their settings. While individual team members did not always agree about how best to build from existing strengths to meet site needs, partly because the different team roles required developing primary relationships with different groups and individuals who emphasized different areas of need at the local and district levels, the team shared a common concern to shape its work around the expressed needs and demonstrated strengths of the assistance sites.

An analogy from tailoring may help to make this pervasive aspect of what came to be the aim of the Chicago Region's assistance style sharper. The assistance team may be compared to a tailor who has engaged to make a suit for a client. The tailor meets his/her client and discusses in broad terms what kind of garment a client desires and the range of garments the tailor has the capacity to make. Out of a larger assortment of designs and fabrics the tailor brings forward those which he/she judges might meet the client's expressed needs. The tailor may include in his/her offerings designs and fabrics he/she has had particular success with in the past, as well as designs and fabrics he/she judges might be especially attractive or functional on the basis of his/her own observations of the client. The client may rapidly choose a design and fabric from this initial round of offerings, select several to choose from, or reject all. If the client rejects a particular design or fabric which the tailor especially likes to use, or knows he/she can use well, the tailor does not go ahead and make the suit out of that design and/or fabric anyway, but instead inquires further as to what the client has in mind and brings forward more samples. The tailor may even find him/herself offering designs and with which he/she has had little or no previous specific experience, if the tailor knows that his/her general skill as a tailor can also apply to making something different. The client may even provide the fabric (or, "I want to use these buttons which belonged to my grandfather") and/or contribute a little or a lot to the design of the suit. While the tailor provides specific skills which usually the client does not have, he/she applies these skills in the service of making a suit which meets the client's needs and desires.

When negotiations began the tailor did not know exactly what suit would result from the process, and the specific suit he/she ends out making differs to some degree from all other suits he/she has made before. At some point an agreement is reached, or is not reached, for the tailor to proceed to make the desired suit. The tailor may be engaged to make several garments. Input from the client continues from the initial negotiations through the final fitting. The essential point of contrast in this analogy is that the client did not decide to buy his/her suit off the rack, but chose to engage the services of a tailor who wanted to construct a suit particularly for him/her.

Distinguishing Roles

While entry as an ongoing process involved others on the staff to a certain extent, particularly the two TA Specialists, the Region Director maintained the primary role of planning and negotiating initial entry and dealing with entry issues when they arose later in the work. Initial entry in District 21 was begun by the Region Director, Frances, in January 1976, while she was a member of what was then one project-wide assistance team, before she became Director of and organized the Chicago Region, and prior to the hiring and assignment of Chicago Region staff. At that time Barbara, who became a TA Specialist in October of 1976, was her Administrative Assistant. Initial entry at the district level involved identifying others within the DTA organization who could assist Frances in making the program more meaningful and relevant to people in the district.

When entry began at the local school level in March 1976, Frances again, because of her contacts and experience with the district, was the major actor in planning and negotiating the steps of entry.

Building Relationships

Entry and assistance at the district level were integrated with entry and assistance at the local school level. Activities and relationships at each level were conceived of as supporting and legitimizing the work at the other level. Some district level staff were directly involved in discussions about what possible local school to enter and in establishing entry at the local school level. Entry and assistance activities often were carried out around the same topics at both the district and local school levels (i.e., open corridor, peer tutoring, early childhood screening, building from cultural strengths). Engaging with specific assistance content areas at both levels, increased legitimacy and established support from one level to the other. Expectations from one level set some realistic limits on what the team could do at the other level. By explaining when entering at the district level that the team would want to sustain its greatest effort at the local schools, and by explaining to school personnel that the team would continue to maintain active relationships and provide some assistance to the district, the team was able to establish a three-way collaborative relationship between the team, the local site, and the district.

Entry at the District Level Building from relationships she already had established with key district level personnel, Frances, as CNS Senior Associate for Schools, began working with District 21's Instructional Support Staff (ISS) in January of 1976. Because many staff members had recently come to the district from dismantled area offices in an administrative organization, the team was new. The Instructional Support Staff for the District Superintendent provides consultation and expertise throughout the district. The group was an ideal arena for both sharing information about activities in the district and introducing ideas and giving workshops which might attract the interest of teachers and principals in local district schools. Frances was interested in supporting the ongoing efforts of the ISS to develop into an internal technical assistance team to serve the district.

From January, 1976, through the time of the writing of this paper, the Region Director has continued to attend meetings with the ISS staff, has engaged in informal face to face and telephone conversations with members several times a week, has been available for consultation, has offered input into district-wide programs and ISS planning, and has generally provided ongoing support and role clarification when needed. The relationships with the District Superintendent and ISS staff provided the opportunity for the Chicago Region to offer seven district level workshops as part of its assistance process in the district. Three of these are being considered here as both district level and local school level entry events, because they introduced on a district-wide level the kinds of programs which later were applied at the local school level as assistance efforts. The three workshops were on early childhood screening, open corridor, and peer tutoring.

Early Childhood Screening Workshop In the ongoing discussions between Frances, the District Superintendent, and his support staff on new programs and directions in the district, the development of two new child-parent centers was mentioned. The idea of a workshop on issues and procedures for the preschool screening of four year olds, which would be of use to the staff and administration of these centers, emerged. In a workshop, held in February 1976, Frances presented a screening instrument developed for use in an area (Evanston) early childhood program she had formerly directed. The screening program aims to identify each child's individual strengths and weaknesses in the following areas: gross motor/perceptual development, fine motor/perceptual development, cognitive or learning development, speech and language development, social/emotional development, and vision and hearing acuity. Frances presented the workshop participants with copies of the book she had co-authored on the screening program. The workshop, attended by the principals and staffs of both child-parent centers, presented sufficiently interesting materials to bring about invitations to continue discussions at each of the centers. Talks with one center led to a second workshop a month later at the school and ended after that. Talks with the Carlson child-parent center eventually led to plans for the Chicago Region to work out the use of the screening instrument with the Carlson administration and staff.

Open Corridor Workshop While the early childhood screening model presented first on the district level and later at Carlson came out of the previous non-DTA experience of the Region Director, the Open Corridor Workshop of May 18, 1976, was developed as a DTA linkage activity. By this time the innovative "program on the third floor" at Reel School had been discovered by DTA. Although the program had no name, it resembled the Responsive Education Program (site 8), one of the nine sites documented by DTA. The DTA site researcher for that site was asked to put together a presentation on open corridor programs and the "teachers from the third floor" at Reel were invited to talk to other workshop participants about their program.

About thirty teachers and principals from the district, including the Reel principal, attended the workshop. After a brief introduction Frances presented the third floor teachers who then talked about how they built their program on the collective skill strengths of each of the four participating teachers.

The site researcher then showed slides, discussed the philosophy of the Responsive Education program, and answered practical questions about how to build such a program. It became apparent to the participants at the workshop that there were many similarities as well as some differences between the two programs. After the workshop the third floor program at Reel came to be called the Open Corridor Program. Shortly thereafter the Reel principal decided that she would develop the entire building in which the program had developed into an open corridor program and during the summer of 1976 the principal began having some brief discussions with the Chicago Region about ways of selecting teachers and extending and developing the program. During the fall of 1976 the assistance team was invited to help the newly expanded program get on its feet.

Peer Tutoring Workshop During the summer of 1976 District 21 decided to use available CETA and public school summer program monies to support a district-wide peer tutoring program. The Technical Assistance Specialist, with the assistance of a CNS staff member from another project, worked with the ISS to train prospective tutors during a two day training workshop. At the workshop, held on July 1 and 2, eight groups of fifty students each between the ages of 14 and 17, with each group accompained by a teacher coordinator and two local college students, rotated among three separate stations dealing with different skills required for peer tutoring and a fourth where they were tested themselves. One of the skill stations was handled by the Chicago TA Specialist, the others by staff from the district. The student groups spent about 45 minutes at each station.

At the DTA team station the program moved in the following sequence:

1. Brief introductory discussion of tutoring done by older siblings in Black families.
2. Film on peer tutoring with the accompanying questions: What does it take to be a good tutor? What are some learning

activities a tutor can use to help a tutee?

3. Group discussion of the film.
4. TA Specialist introduced role play activity by a short demonstration.
5. Role play in which "experienced tutors" made suggestions about tutoring to an "inexperienced tutor," and then used signs to show the ideas to the whole group.

The DTA team program included several strategies which differentiated it from the programs available at the other stations. First, it offered an overall rationale for peer tutoring which built upon cultural strengths by relating tutoring to family activity with which students already were familiar. Second, it used audio/visual material based on a community setting similar to Chicago's south side, to which students could relate. Third, it used strategies for involving students as a group, including group brainstorming, recording on newsprint, discussion, and feedback. Finally, it included role play activity in which groups of five to six students had the opportunity to practice.

The summer peer tutoring workshop was generally termed a success by a district level staff person who was basing her comments on those of some students and teachers who participated. This response to the work indicates the Region's ability to contribute at the district-wide level. At the close of the summer, team members received strong positive feedback from both tutor trainees and district staff about their contribution to the workshop. Finally, the workshop attracted the attention of a Reel teacher who had initiated peer tutoring, in his class, and who invited the team to repeat its part of the workshop at Reel School.

The district level workshops served as major avenues of entry for the assistance team into local school settings. In setting up the workshops the team worked with district support staff and the District Superintendent to identify appropriate invitees. The invitations were sent out from the district office, with the support and sanction of the District Superintendent, for the most part enhancing the legitimacy of the team at the local school level.

Identifying Links

Like the Eugene/Oakland Region, the Chicago Region was familiarizing itself with the nine sites information while the initial entry processes were going on. While Frances, especially, but also the other members of the assistance team which she began assembling in the summer of 1976, had significant previous experience with Chicago public schools, including District 21, they worked to increase their knowledge about previous experiences, current needs, special interests, and relationships between parts and the whole, for both the district and local school levels. While the necessary groundwork for more complete linkage was being laid, limiting the extent to which the full linkage process could be carried out in the entry stage, one major linkage activity was carried out during entry, and before a TA-Doc Linker was assigned to the Region.

At the time of a project wide meeting around linkage involving seven staff from across the project to develop strategies for carrying out linkage, Frances arranged a luncheon including both the DTA linkage meeting participants and ISS members, the District Superintendent, and the principal of Reel School. Knowing that she, herself, at that point had limited direct knowledge of Documentation Team information sources, Frances decided it might be fruitful to arrange a meeting where persons more knowledgeable about the nine sites, including a New York site researcher (Chitra), could come into direct contact with key people from District 21. More specifically, she suspected by that point that there was some resemblance between the Reel

School "program on the third floor" and the open corridor program at the New York site documented by Chitra be attending the linkage meeting. In the informal discussion setting provided by the luncheon the Reel school principal and the New York Site Researcher had the opportunity to discover some similarities between the two programs. At the end of the luncheon, the Reel principal insisted that arrangements be made for the site researcher to visit her school. So in this case an assistance site participant assisted by the Region Director, played a key role in identifying what proved to be a fruitful link between a documentation site and an assistance site.

When Yvonne became part of the team as TA-Doc Linker in August 1976, in addition to joining the rest of the team in learning more about District 21 and particularly the Reel and Carlson Schools, she began a process of identifying for the team members what information about the nine sites was available and how they could gain access to it. This effort culminated in a handbook (See King, 1977) which she wrote for the use of team members. She also gave a copy of the guide to the Eugene/Oakland TA-Doc Linker for that Region's use.

Using Materials

To support the face to face exchange of information in entry activities at the District level and at Reel School the Region team also distributed the CNS brochure publications list, and a number of papers written by CNS staff members. In addition, the DTA photo gallery, an idea which Frances was instrumental in actualizing, was used to represent concretely the range of activities at the nine sites.

As part of the major linkage effort of the entry stage, as well as (a major one in the assistance process) the New York site researcher from the Responsive Education site used many materials in her presentation at the district level. These included:

1. A paper she wrote which dealt with her observations and pulled together some of the interpretations of the Responsive Education Program.

2. A slide tape of the Responsive Education program which she had obtained permission to show at the workshop.

3. Samples of art and writing materials produced by students in the program.

4. A floor plan of one classroom in which the Responsive Education Program staff had worked, drawn up, at Chitra's request, by the students of one teacher to emphasize the importance of utilizing space from the point of view of students.

Frances requested that the workshop be videotaped by the DTA Media Specialist, to capture the information shared at the workshop in a form which could be used with other groups. Because of technical problems, however, the taping was not successful.

Checking for Usefulness

Checking for usefulness during the entry stage by the Chicago Region was an ongoing and pervasive activity which could especially be observed in the team meetings and through the use of certain other structures and activities including: (1) Written reactions to district level workshops by participants, which later were analyzed and shared with the team as a whole; (2) The establishment of relationships which had both professional and personal dimensions with both district level and local school level participants, especially by the Region Director and the two TA Specialists; (3) The Region Director's establishment of a weekly "day in the field," which insured that she would have regular face to face exchanges with both district and local school level participants; (4) The frequent use of phone calls with ISS members and local school administrators by the Region Director to keep information flowing; (5) The regular presence of the TA Specialists at the local school sites at least two days a week; (6) The establishment of the Analyst position, which included a specific charge to raise questions and issues about the functioning of the team in the field to the attention of the team as a whole; (7) The establishment of the TA-Doc Linker role, which included the specific charge to facilitate the use of the nine sites information in the assistance process; (8) The establishment of differentiated roles, insuring that different perspectives (linkage with the nine sites information, needs of parents, teachers, administrators, and district level personnel, as well as those associated with the three DTA purposes) would be represented at the weekly team-wide meetings and at other times.

In the many discussions that were held relating to designing and carrying out specific entry and assistance activities a functional focus became apparent as the following questions were raised: (1) Who fills what specific roles and how many team members are needed at different workshops and other events? (2) How can team members gain the necessary additional training and experience to be effective? (3) Who is invited to participate at different workshops and other events and what does each person bring to the event? (4) What specific steps of groundwork (prequestioning, information gathering, training, involving appropriate people, timing, etc.) need to be carried out before entry and assistance activities can be expected to be successful? (5) How can assistance models be made concrete so that participants can effectively identify the similarities and differences between their situations and those represented by the models, and thereby have a basis for deciding what parts of the models can be useful to them and in what ways? In addition to the functional focus was an ongoing effort to make ideas the team was bringing forward to site participants concrete through the use of materials and face to face encounters and which were, where possible, linked to the experience-bases of participants.

Entry events were useful to the team's agenda in that they helped the team: (1) clarify site needs, (2) identify and carry out trial run use of models to address those needs, (3) enhance its reputation with site participants, (4) establish the basis for ongoing information exchanges both at the district and throughout the local school levels, (5) begin entry at the local school level through district level workshops, and (6) establish the interactive groundwork for simultaneous relationships with both district level and local school level participants.

Providing Assistance

Before proceeding with the frame by frame analysis of the assistance offered by the Chicago Region, the major assistance activities are briefly described at three local schools and at the district level.

Carlson Child Parent Center Following the district-wide Early Childhood Screening Workshop in February 1976, interest was expressed early in the spring by Carlson administrators in the possibility of using the Early Childhood Screening program model the following school year. Discussions between the Region Director and the Center's staff continued during that spring and summer. The Region Director met regularly with the Head Teacher of Carlson during her weekly visits to District 21.

Later in the spring, Frances attempted to coordinate her visits with another CNS staff member, as part of an effort CNS was then making to share resources and spread staff expertise across CNS projects. When the issue of parent involvement was raised as one of the possible areas of assistance at Carlson the CNS Senior Associate for Community was brought in to assume primary responsibility for discussions with school staff about parent involvement. Out of these meetings, which came to involve the school nurse and parent coordinator, and where strategies to involve more parents in the school programs were discussed, Frances introduced an idea which had emerged from her discussions with the DTA Research Coordinator (who later was to become the Region's TA-Doc Linker) for bringing a parent from the Los Diablos site to the school to talk with the parents about parent involvement at her site. This linkage activity will be discussed in the description of assistance activities at Lucille Upper Grade Center (U.G.C), because while the idea first emerged in and seemed promising for the Carlson setting, difficulties arose which led to its being implemented instead at Lucille.

Meanwhile, the Region Director interviewed several of the Carlson staff, attended a dedication of the Center's new facility, and worked with the DTA Media Specialist to develop a "photo gallery" on the Center. In September a general consensus had emerged to introduce the screening program to the Carlson staff. A formal agreement was never reached, however, and the staff as a whole did not identify a clear need for the instrument.

In the winter of 1975, the staff of the Center was beginning its first full year of operation as a Chicago public school Child Parent Center. The Center was in the process of identifying and establishing its relationship with the rest of the Reel school complex across the street. The new staff had been carefully selected for their special training in working with preschool age children. Some of the staff had already decided that they wanted to explore using the Early Childhood Screening program. The assistance team was still incomplete, with two positions yet to be filled. The team members were getting to know each other while attempting to carry out new roles in providing ongoing technical assistance. The team was experiencing pressure, partly from DTA, to demonstrate the capacity to carry out useful and observable technical assistance without making site participants dependent upon their assistance. Individual site participants needed to demonstrate their own credibility by showing both the team and the district that they already were doing or considering some of the things the team was suggesting, such as assessing student needs.

The plan to introduce the screening program involved by the following steps, which initially were generally developed by the assistance team and then shared with the head teacher:

1. Meeting with staff to plan staff development and screening of four year olds.
2. Visit to observe Evanston's screening program in action.
3. Staff seminar led by a psychologist with the Evanston program on the social and emotional development of preschool children.
4. Team assistance in a screening and procedures field test.
5. Seminar on screening of children led by the Evanston Speech and Language Clinician.
6. Team assistance to staff in actual screening.

While the assistance proceeded through these steps, difficulties became increasingly apparent.

In planning the implementation of the screening program, the Principal of Reel and the Head Teacher of Carlson wanted to involve the available support staff, including the Center's parent coordinator, and the district level community liaison person, speech teacher, and social worker. They decided to use support and administrative staff in some of the screening positions suggested for teachers by the Evanston model. The information resulting from the screening was intended to help teachers individualize their programs and coordinate their curricula. The teachers, however, while required to become familiar with the screening program, were not to be primarily involved in modifying or adapting it to the Carlson setting and were to be involved in carrying out the screening at only two of the six screening stations. Besides the potential difficulties arising from the teachers' limited involvement in the selection, adaptation, and use of the screening program, the fact that some of the support staff could be at the Center only parts of each week increased the difficulties of organizing their time to conduct the actual screening.

With the beginning in September of joint planning by the assistance team and Carlson staff for the implementation of the screening program, Barbara, who had recently become the team's first Technical Assistance Specialist, assumed the primary responsibility for carrying out assistance activities at the Center, including arranging for the Evanston consultants' visits. She was assisted by Kathy, a staff member from another CNS project.

The orientation meeting held on September 9 was attended by Barbara, Kathy, Frances, the Head Teacher, two teachers whose students would be screened first, the district social worker, the school parent coordinator, and one other part time staff person. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss what materials would be needed for administering the screening program and to answer general questions about it.

On October 5, Barbara and Kathy, as advisors, accompained two teachers, the district social worker and speech teacher, and the school parent coordinator and one other part time staff person on a field trip to the Evanston school system to observe the preschool screening program that had been used there for several years. During this trip the visitors observed the Evanston Speech and Language Clinician administering the screening instruments to one child, and discussed her use of the instruments.

Two days later a psychologist with the Evanston program came in to discuss and explain further issues in the administration of the "Child Behavior Profile" explained in a book by Holliday and Olswant (1974) and suggested as a technique for use in the screening program "to determine in a rather gross way whether a family should be recontacted to determine if the child has a social or emotional problem." Two of the issues raised by the staff were differences about the appropriate role for parents in the screening procedure, and the problem of developing a curriculum to meet the needs identified in the screening. While the psychologist was trying to get the staff to understand when outside resource people were needed at the Center, one senior teacher raised several questions about the instrument, including problems of scoring, the instrument's failure to distinguish between males and females, and whether or not it was necessary to bring in outside people and materials to supplement the Center's already existing curriculum. The teacher asked: "Should the profile change what we do in the classroom? . . . we have quite a lot a materials now. We might not need to do things differently."

The marked absence of enthusiasm shown at the seminar was again apparent at the practice screening session scheduled one week later. When Barbara and Kathy arrived it appeared as though they were not expected on that day. Most of the materials for the practice screening had not been gathered together, and Barbara and Kathy spent the afternoon working with some of the non-teaching staff gathering some materials. They then left a list of the remaining materials needed, which were to be gathered by the following day in preparation for the Evanston Speech and Language Clinician's visit to the school. No screening took place that day.

The Speech and Language Clinician had been asked by Barbara to assist at her October 15 visit to Carlson in discussing the setting up of the six screening stations that were being created to screen individual students. Because no trial screening had yet been done, the session could not focus on a discussion of problems and issues encountered in a trial run. Instead the Clinician helped conduct a practice screening involving one child. A brief general discussion about the screening process was followed by consideration of what steps to take next in preparing for screening all the four year olds.

Shortly after these events, at an orientation session at CNS to introduce prospective new assistance team members to the District Superintendent and an ISS staff member, and to discuss team plans, the ISS member suggested that the teachers at Carlson felt uncomfortable about the screening work, that they were not sufficiently informed or involved with the procedures, and that the team would do well to talk with the teachers and bring them more fully into the process.

In a memo from Barbara to the Head Teacher dated October 22, Barbara expressed enjoyment of her visit earlier in the day, pleasure in the way the Head Teacher was "moving forward with plans for the screening program," and indicated the availability of both herself and Kathy to assist in conducting the Head Teacher's planned practice session to be held on October 28. She expressed confidence that Carlson's screening program was going to be "fantastic." At this point the team was viewing its role as involving little additional initiative in carrying through the screening program, instead being responsive to specific requests for providing some supportive assistance, and working toward withdrawal from providing regular assistance at Carlson. The circumstances of the team's withdrawal from the Carlson site will be examined more fully in a later section.

Lucille Upper Grade Center While Lucille was never considered a major assistance site, two significant assistance events did take place in the Lucille setting. The first occurred on June 4, 1976, after plans to hold a parent participation workshop at Carlson fell through. The second occurred on November 16, after the principal of Lucille contacted Frances when the school was beginning to redesign its program as a result of changes in the district.

In conversations with Yvonne, who was then a Research Coordinator for the Los Diablos site, Frances heard about the active parent involvement at that site. Yvonne and Frances began to consider two parents at the Los Diablos site as potential resource people who might stimulate discussion and strategies for involving parents if brought to Chicago to address parents and staff at Carlson. When the idea initially was introduced to some Carlson staff by Frances, the school people said they would like to consider it further as part of their upcoming Parents Day. Through further discussions in May it became clear to the team that the sort of linkage visit they were proposing would not meet the needs that were being expressed by the site participants. The assistance team members and some site participants had somewhat different definitions of parent involvement.

Meanwhile Yvonne, acting partly from DTA pressure to conduct linkage activities, contacted participants at the Los Diablos site to discuss the possibility of sending a parent representative to talk with parents at a Chicago school. Mrs. Smith was selected and she and Yvonne then held phone conversations to prepare for the visit.

After the date of Carlson's Parents Day had been changed twice, Frances, with input from other DTA staff, decided to find another school in the district where the linkage idea could be tested.

As a result of her contacts within the district, Frances was able to get an invitation from Lucille for Mrs. Smith to make her presentation there. The principal of Lucille mailed his invitations to the event to all parents who were planning to have a child in the school the following year.

The workshop was held on June 4 in the Lucille School library. Representing DTA and CNS were Frances, Yvonne, Barbara, who was then a technical assistance intern, the CNS Senior Associate for Community, a Study Team representative, and a DTA media specialist who was there to videotape the event. No videotape resulted, however, because of technical problems. After being introduced, Frances began the workshop by asking the parents to stand. Approximately 20 of the about 40 site participants there stood up. Frances gave a brief overview of the workshop and introduced the CNS staff members who were present. She gave a slide presentation on the DTA project, including work in District 21. One slide was of an administrator from the Lucille site. Then Yvonne, presented some statistical information about the Los Diablos school system and told the group about Mrs. Smith, pointing out that Mrs. Smith had been an educator, parent, and school worker for twenty-five years.

Mrs. Smith began by saying that she hoped to be able to share her experiences in a way which would be useful to those present. She showed a segment of a videotape demonstrating how some parents at her site trained to deal with school issues. Mentioning that she liked to see parents volunteer, she said she believed that parents like to see that they are appreciated. Stating that she could not speak for Lucille but could speak for Los Diablos schools, she said that there children were being "suspended, pushed out, expelled, opportunity transferred," and "We [that is, her group] are usually called in to help." She said many parents at Los Diablos did not know teachers were their "employees." Some parents did not know that they had the right to go into a school and talk to the principal.

Then, talking about discipline, she emphasized that it begins early. Parents begin by saying things such as "She has a mouth like Aunt Josephine," or "Look at him, he walks and talks like old Uncle Tom," and then they wait until he begins to act like old Uncle Tom.

Mrs. Smith mentioned a book the parents could get on the topic of parents' rights. She then asked the group questions that encouraged them to respond to what she was saying, such as, "I'm sure you have plenty of parent participation." Some in the group responded, "No, we don't."

She pointed out that when children come to school they already are doing things that they have learned. She placed the real responsibility for the child learning at school on the teacher who is getting paid to do that job. Parents could prepare children for school and in some cases visit to see how the children were doing. But some parents have to go to work every day. She suggested that teachers could visit parents some of the time.

Mrs. Smith pointed out that children are so intelligent that prior to being able to talk they are able to communicate and let parents know their needs. She stressed the need to listen to children and the importance of watching them at play. She said that if you really pay attention to children and listen to what they are saying you can tell whether or not they are telling you the truth. By this point there appeared to be a unity in the group, demonstrated by the responses from both teachers and parents.

Mrs. Smith ended her talk by reciting a poem she had written about a little boy which emphasized the need to "listen to your child." The audience applauded vigorously and the meeting turned into a question and answer session on such topics as techniques for organizing parents, and where the suggested book could be obtained.

After evaluation cards were passed out by the assistance team, the principal closed the session by saying he was glad to see so many parents out and was thankful to Mrs. Smith for the information she had given the group. After the meeting, the parents and teachers gathered around Mrs. Smith to continue the discussion. Some thanked her for coming, saying that she had been inspiring.

The presentation by Mrs. Smith was not part of any larger assistance context created by either the team or the school and had no follow-up.

Several months later the principal of Lucille phoned Frances to arrange to get some reactions from the Chicago Region assistance team to his ideas about how to restructure the school's program into a District 21 Academic Center. The phone conversation led to a meeting at CNS where the principal sought the team's ideas about how the teachers might work together with parents to think about what this restructuring would mean for the school in its day to day functioning.

The discussion led to the workshop described below, which was carried out on November 16. Forty site participants were present, of whom six were parents.

The principal began the workshop by saying that DTA staff members were present and reminding participants of "the wonderful and effective seminar last June with Mrs. Smith." He said that he had asked the people from CNS to come back to Lucille to assist the school in thinking about how to restructure its program, and that was the purpose of this meeting.

Barbara began with a brief overview of the workshop, explaining the roles of those present from DTA, and then introduced Carl, a Technical Assistance Specialist, who would talk about "career education." In his talk Carl gave examples of career education programs that are primarily vocational. He also talked about experience based learning, giving as an example the alternative high school in Chicago that people who later formed CNS helped to design and implement. Carl also mentioned the types of lists and information that are available for school staff and parents on the topic of career education. Carl brought Barbara back before the group to talk more about DTA.

Barbara discussed the DTA issue of how knowledge can be transferred from one place to another. She mentioned her recent visit to three schools in Washington and that she had thought about Lucille while there. She mentioned that DTA has researchers who are documenting the work in schools in places such as Washington, and that they have developed some "hunches or ideas about problem solving." Barbara then listed these, saying a bit about how DTA staff tended to define them:

(1) unifying them, (2) tradition of skills to support a theme, (3) internal flexibility, (4) flexibility or openness to change, (5) roles that serve as foci for internal change, (6) structures smaller than the whole school, such as teams, (7) organizational structures that allow teachers to collaborate and support each other, (8) staff characteristics, including a principal who supports parent and teacher activities, (9) existence of political networks with "higher-ups" in the system, (10) networks and resources that link with outside information sources, and (11) a state of consciousness that supports teachers, including a shared feeling that teaching is a profession, teacher role definitions that include school wide planning, and shared belief in the ability of students to learn.

Barbara also pointed out that researchers have some ideas about the roles that parents and students can play in this type of school. Student roles can be defined so that they support student involvement in the development of the school's learning program. One role that parents can play is that of acting as a political fighting force. Barbara then told the group that Frances would discuss a CNS concept of "critical activities."

Frances explained how CNS defined and used the concept of "critical activities," gave a brief description of their stages, and stressed the importance of making the best use of the school's internal resource people. She mentioned that Lucille's assistant principal was quite familiar with some of the CNS resources as a result of having worked on CNS' Community Based Learning Project. She invited participants to visit CNS to find out more about its resources and use its "resource box." Frances then asked those present to participate in a small group activity using a list of critical activities that had been handed out.

Barbara explained the procedure, asking the participants in the groups to keep in mind that all of the activities listed might not be critical for them. The groups were asked to decide which critical activities might apply to their school and list some strategies for bringing about these activities. Back in the large group the reporters selected by each small group shared the results of their discussions, and the workshop came to a close.

The team saw this event as a short term assistance activity, and planned no follow-up. They did tell the participants that the team was available to respond to further requests for advice and assistance.

Reel Discussions between Frances and the principal of Reel began right after the February 1976 district level screening workshop. While the early discussions were around the Reel/Carlson Parent Child Center, the principal mentioned the existence of the "program on the third floor" at her school. After visiting the program, Frances offered some suggestions regarding sources of materials useful to innovative educational efforts, including a nearby teacher center.

On April 1, Frances interviewed the two assistant principals. She told them about the DTA project and CNS. She also disclosed that she had attended Reel Elementary School herself and had taught for many years in the Chicago public school system. On April 6 Frances followed up these interviews with a letter thanking the assistant principals for the visit, enclosing additional information about CNS and DTA, and seeking their assistance by saying, "On my next visit, I would like to get some ideas from you . . . on ways I might be able to distribute [a 'Diagnosis of Interests' questionnaire] to the entire staff." The letter also listed names of teachers suggested by the principal, with whom Frances should try to talk during her weekly visits at Reel.

Following ongoing discussions with her, Frances invited the Reel principal to the DTA linkage luncheon on April 7. As a result Chitra, a New York Site Researcher, was invited by the principal to spend some time at the school with participants in the "third floor program." This visit led to the district-wide Open Corridor workshop held on May 18.

On May 6 Frances began to interview two of the teachers suggested by the principal. The interview format which was eventually used with eleven Reel teachers assured the exchange of information concerning certain topics. Frances began by briefly describing who she was, why she was there, and where she was from. She then introduced the Study Team representative who was observing the interview. She told the person being interviewed about the team's work in District 21, including that it was involved in regular meetings with the ISS. She told the teacher being interviewed what work in the district was being planned at that time, and mentioned the team's plans for work at Carlson. Frances then explained that her role in the interviews was to talk with as many teachers as possible about what they would like to see happening in their school, what they saw as the strengths of themselves and their school, and what they wanted to do ultimately in their school. She openly explained that the team was interested in working at Reel because it already was doing some interesting things.

On the same day Frances met with the four third floor teachers and introduced Barbara, who had become a technical assistance intern, to them. One week later Barbara interviewed the four teachers she had met the week before to gather information about their needs, interests, and concerns in preparation for the upcoming district-wide Open Corridor workshop. Frances continued to interview the teachers suggested by the principal, as well as some others. During each visit to the school, Frances and Barbara stopped in to meet briefly with the principal to share information and develop ideas for the team's work in the school.

Shortly after the Open Corridor workshop, the Reel principal decided to use the facilities of the old building at Reel by expanding the third floor Open Corridor program there to the rest of the building. During the summer of 1976 she set the expanded program in place by selecting certain teachers and reassigning them into the building. While two of those selected declined the opportunity, most felt that they were encouraged to comply. During the summer the DTA/CNS technical assistance staff had met from time to time with the principal to discuss alternative selection procedures, suggesting that self-selection might be a more appropriate way of staffing the expanded program.

The principal expressed enthusiasm about the Open Corridor program, pleasure that it had been initiated from within the school by the third floor teachers, and a desire to see an exciting, innovative program at her school, which did not require much additional funding, develop into a model from which the school as a whole as well as other schools in the district could perhaps benefit. The principal's enthusiasm was not fully matched by the ten newly appointed teachers. (Only two of the original four third floor teachers were able to continue in the program.) Most of them did not have extensive experience with an Open Corridor approach, and though they were able to feel the excitement in developing a demonstration model they were also somewhat intimidated, partly because they were not sure about the consequences to themselves if they turned down the opportunity to participate in the program. The combination of the principal's enthusiasm for the program, and her restraint about laying down guidelines for the teachers out of concern that she might restrict their flexibility and autonomy, along with some teachers' ambivalence about being in the program and uncertainty about what standards they were to be judged by, led to some friction and unease in the relationship between the principal and the teacher's at the beginning of the school year, causing the program to get off to a slow start.

In September and October of 1976 the assistance team's work at the Reel School complex focused primarily on developing the screening program for Carlson. While the exchange of information between Barbara and Frances and the Reel principal and Open Corridor teachers continued through regular visits to the site, including brief interviews with the new Open Corridor teachers, no formal assistance events were carried out at Reel during this period.

Yvonne, who was still spending a significant amount of time winding up her Research Corrdinator responsibilities, visited five sites, funded by NIE and documented by DTA, to expand her experience base for filling the TA-Doc Linker role. In mid-October she and Barbara visited Federal City and schools related to three of the New York sites and on October 20 Yvonne visited the Iroquois City site.

While exploratory discussions about the team's role at Reel were continuing, and the search and hiring process for the team's second Technical Assistance Specialist and Analyst/Developer was winding up, Barbara prepared for and carried out a peer tutoring training session held on November 4 for forty Open Corridor students and their teachers. The session, resulting from a request by an Open Corridor teacher, followed the format of the Region's part of the summer district-wide Peer Tutoring workshop. The newly hired second TA Specialist and Analyst/Developer were present as well as the TA-Doc Linker. The session was followed up with an inservice session on November 8 during which informal discussion was held on implementation issues: i.e., selection of tutees, pairing of tutors and tutees, supervision of tutors, space, materials, and preparation of tutors.

The tutoring program petered out after three or four months. The system of coordination among teachers across floors was quite elaborate and required extra time. Some teachers reported that tutors suffered from lack of supervision and lost interest. Although the team was not asked to participate in the organization and procedures of the program beyond assisting at the November 8 inservice session, it also did not offer to work with the interested teachers beyond indicating it would be available to respond to their specific requests for help.

On November 2, Yvonne, Barbara, and Steve, the Iroquois City site researcher, conducted a conference call to plan the framework for an upcoming inservice session at Reel with a participant from the Iroquois City site. During this discussion Steve asked questions to clarify the assistance team's assessment of what kind of resource person would be helpful and how that person could be selected in such a way as also to meet the funded site's needs. Having approval from ongoing discussions with the Reel principal to go ahead with the planning for the inservice session, the site participants of the Iroquois City site were invited to select someone from the site to make a presentation to Reel teachers and staff to discuss the development of an open education program at their site on December 8. The Iroquois City site carried out its own selection process and chose Jean Taylor, the teacher/media center coordinator at one of its schools.

Meanwhile Barbara was able to report at a team meeting on November 24 that the Reel principal had told her she would like the assistance team to focus their work on the Open Corridor program content; while the teachers as a whole would receive assistance on interpersonal relationships from inservice sessions provided by another group of consultants she had hired. The principal said that there would be some overlap between the areas of assistance provided by the two groups, but she wanted to be clear about the areas of emphasis as she saw them. At the same team meeting Carl reported on his progress in getting information about possible university support and credit for an eight week training course for Reel Open Corridor teachers and parents for which the team had begun developing ideas. The team decided to get input from the teachers about the timing, content, and format for such a course before proceeding with the specific planning.

The Jean Taylor inservice session took place on December 8. The presentation was given twice, in order to accommodate the Open Corridor teachers who were not all freed from their classroom activities at the same time.

The inservice was structured as follows. Frances introduced herself and the Chicago Region and DTA staff members present. In presenting Jean to the group, Frances read the brief description of Jean and her experience which was in the handout that was given to the participants as they entered the room. Jean established a tone of mutuality and informality by telling the Reel teachers that the teachers at her school had told her to have a good time and tell them what she had learned when she came back. Thus she felt the meeting would be a sharing and exchange process, and she felt she was going to learn from the Reel teachers just as they were hoping to learn from her. She also said that before leaving her school she had asked the teachers there what she should tell teachers at Reel. She said they all responded by saying she should speak about goal setting. She asked the participants to start out by asking her any questions about things in the program that concerned them. Since there were no questions, she began to ask individuals, some of whom she had met before the meeting, for information about themselves, such as on what floor in the Open Corridor program a teacher taught. This gave her some information about the Reel teachers, such as what grade levels the teachers represented, helping her to ascertain what their concerns might be.

Jean placed importance on the teachers' voluntary involvement in open education programs and asked the principal if the teachers had chosen to participate. The principal replied, "Yes, with some persuasion." When the teachers were asked the same question they responded with some laughter.

In order to give the inservice participants a visual idea of the activities at her school, Jean showed some slides she had brought. She pointed out that she anticipated that people would say the program was working because it had a new facility, so she had brought pictures of the old facility where the idea had begun. She said some staff had felt the old facility was better, because participants were freer to do things such as paint walls and to feel good about those improvements. While showing the pictures, Jean mentioned some specific ways in which the program differed from traditional educational settings, such as the freedom to move and to remove desks, and students calling teachers by their first names.

After showing the slides, Jean answered questions from the teachers centering around the following areas: setting goals, how common space was used, ways for students to help each other such as operating a store they created themselves, scheduling meetings for participating teachers, and building in time for individual planning.

The inservice session ended with members of the group thanking Jean and asking her to give them information about where she could be contacted in the future. Jean gave the information and Barbara pointed out that she also would give it to others later if needed. Two teachers did ask Barbara for this information later. The principal then invited all of the participants down to one of the classrooms for lunch, saying that this would allow people to continue the discussions with Jean if they wanted. Jean repeated the session in the afternoon for the five Open Corridor teachers who had been unable to attend the morning session. As with most formal assistance events, district personnel were invited to attend.

At the end of each session the assistance team handed out brief questionnaires (one page, four questions) so the participants could indicate how they found the session helpful, or not helpful, and what topics they would like to explore further.

During November and December the team held meetings to discuss its work at Reel, to attempt to clarify team roles, and to plan future activities. In the late fall the team had called a meeting of all the teachers in the Open Corridor program and proposed that the teachers meet on a more regular basis to discuss program goals, share information, and work together. At this time the notion of a series of workshops dealing with topics of concern to the teachers was proposed and greeted with interest. Further conversations with the teachers made it clear that an evening, university connected, training course was not what they needed at the time. This information led to a reconsideration of both format and time for the training program, since the team wanted to meet teachers' needs as well as those of parents of children in the Open Corridor program.

On January 1 Barbara and Carl presented the revised Open Corridor training program proposal at a special half-hour meeting attended by nine of the twelve Open Corridor teachers and the resource center teacher/

coordinator for the school. The team proposed a series of seven weekly workshop/seminar sessions to take place beginning January 18 in an auxiliary room on the third floor which the Open Corridor staff was developing into a Resource Center to house materials and literature. The proposed time, which had been discussed with staff individually beforehand, was from 8:10 to 8:50, just before the beginning of the regular school day. Part of the purpose of the training program, for both the assistance team and the teachers, was to involve parents. The training program was viewed by the teachers as having the potential not only to encourage greater teacher-teacher cooperation, but also greater teacher-parent cooperation. It was agreed that parental participation would be encouraged through correspondence. Other issues discussed were the development of a Resource Center for the Open Corridor program and the possibility of Open Corridor teachers writing proposals to seek funding for the program for the summer.

The workshops actually began on January 25 and ran through a series of eight sessions, with a break during the fifth week, when the team, instead, conducted an inservice session on Wednesday to introduce the team and its work to all the teachers at Reel. Five of the workshops, falling toward the beginning of the series, followed a workshop/seminar format; three of the workshops, falling toward the beginning of the series, followed a workshop/seminar format; three of the workshops, falling toward the end of the series, followed a workshop/meeting format. A summary of the dates and topics of the sessions follows:

Workshop #1.	January 25.	Establishing goals for the Open Corridor program.
Workshop #2.	February 1.	Establishing goals, and setting up learning stations.
Workshop #3.	February 8.	Learning stations.
Workshop #4.	February 15.	Team teaching.

Workshop/Meeting #5. March 1. Planning future workshops.

Workshop #6. March 8. Seminar on Community as a Resource.

Workshop/Meeting #7. March 15. Feedback on March 8 seminar and explanation of CNS, DTA, Study Team, and the role of technical assistance at Reel.

Workshop/Meeting #8. March 29. Evaluation and planning.

While planning and implementing the workshops was the responsibility of the assistance team, specifically Barbara and Carl, two or three times during the course of the workshops the Open Corridor staff was reminded that at the end of the sequence it would be "on its own." The team, however, maintained the initiative-taking roles for planning, developing, and facilitating the workshops, based on input on content from the teaching staff. When the team expected the staff to begin taking initiatives in carrying on its own development activities toward the end of the workshop series, the staff expressed some bewilderment, saying they had not been appropriately prepared to assume the developing and facilitating roles the team had been carrying out, and questioning the role of technical assistance.

Within the Chicago Region team itself, the two TA Specialists researched and developed ideas, exercises, and materials such as handouts and slide shows, and were the primary conductors of the workshops. Other members of the team were utilized as resources for workshop inputs, planning, feedback, and evaluation. Teachers were not involved in arranging to use CNS and DTA resources for the workshops other than providing information on their needs as they related to a particular event. The two TA Specialists negotiated beforehand who would have the major responsibility for a particular workshop, and who would have more of a backup or support role. Barbara, who had been with CNS and the team longer, usually took the larger role in conceptualizing and carrying out the workshops. The TA Specialists saw their roles in conducting workshops as group facilitators, providers of specific information on the selected workshop topic, and as resource people.

Often two or three teachers arrived on time and, while waiting for the other teachers to arrive, became involved in informal discussions with assistance team members. Handouts and visual materials as well as a formal agenda were on display prior to the arrival of workshop participants.

The workshops were intended to involve parents as well as teachers. Although six parents attended the first workshop, the number dwindled to one at the next two workshops, none at the fourth, and two at the fifth. Eight parents attended the sixth workshop, which brought in as special resource people a Teacher Advisor and the Chairperson of the Black Parents Union from one of the schools at a New York funded site. Part of the difficulty in getting parents to participate was the inconvenience of the early morning time.

Barbara and Carl usually spent much of the school day on Tuesdays and Thursdays, as well as some other time when necessary, at Reel. Besides regularly conducting the workshops on Tuesdays and carrying out certain other planned assistance events, they usually carried out some or all of the following functions when at the school:

1. Discussing with each other, and other team members when present, how particular assistance events had gone, including how they were useful to the team's agenda.
2. Making arrangements for upcoming assistance events.
3. Carrying out brief talks with the principal (usually Barbara did this).
4. Being around to hear the current concerns and needs of teachers about the Open Corridor program, the school as a whole, the district, and the TA Specialist role in relationship to the principal.
5. Responding to specific requests from teachers for information or materials.

The team demonstrated its availability to follow up on specific requests for additional information which came up both in the workshop setting and at other times. For instance, one of the Open Corridor teachers told Carl about the behavior of one of his students who required a lot of special attention in class. On Carl's next visit to the school, he stopped in to talk with the teacher and while there asked if he could have a brief talk with the student. When Carl was again at the school a few days later, the teacher asked Carl what he had said to the student, commenting that he had seen a change in the student's behavior and thought it was partly because of what Carl said.

In another example, prior to the beginning of one of the early morning workshops, a teacher raised with Barbara the issue of finding reading materials for older students with below average reading skills. Barbara mentioned that she had had contact with a teacher in another school who had come across some material which met this need. Barbara brought three of these workbooks to the Reel teacher in one of her visits to the school shortly thereafter.

At the first workshop, on establishing goals for the Open Corridor program, it was decided that all school community members as well as district office personnel should participate in goal setting for the program, perhaps aided by consultants. A goal setting committee was formed of parents and teachers. The group compiled questions that the committee might consider.

The second workshop continued the discussion of goals and began the planning to set up learning stations on the three Open Corridor floors. The third workshop, which was documented on videotape by media specialists hired by the team, continued the discussion of learning centers, with participants observing the learning centers that the teachers on each floor had been working to set up. The Goal Committee had not met and so could not report. Early drafts of case studies of the NIE funded sites were distributed to four teachers and the principal who were asked to read them and to express their reactions. The readers planned to donate fees they would receive for the reading to the development of the Open Corridor Resource Center.

The fourth workshop was intended to introduce the topic of team teaching and to assist teachers and parents (although no parents were present) in identifying individual and collective strengths and interests. The workshop participants were asked to define team teaching terms and do a team rating analysis survey.

An inservice session for all Reel teachers was held on February 23 in place of an Open Corridor workshop that week. At this session, attended by thirty teachers, the principal, Barbara, Carl, Yvonne, and Sylvia (the team's administrative assistant), the Chicago Region staff were introduced to the Reel school staff. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: to acquaint those teachers, unfamiliar with the team, with the team members and what they were doing at Reel and to ask how the team might assist other teachers in their efforts.

The fifth workshop marked the beginning of the transition from the team's developing the workshops toward their seeking greater teacher involvement in the workshop development. It was conducted by Carl, with Barbara not present. The team's purposes were to secure from the teachers an understanding of their content needs for subsequent workshops or interactions with the assistance team and to clarify the assignment of roles and responsibilities in the assistance process. The teachers participated actively in the discussion. The case study reading was almost completed at this point, and some questions were raised by teachers about what was said and how it was said in some of them. Although the issue was not resolved at this meeting, questions about the roles of the assistance team at Reel were raised by the teachers. Some teachers said they did not understand what "facilitation" meant. Some said they did not understand why the team refused to engage in directly advising teachrs within their classrooms. Some said they felt that the expectation that one of the program staff would assume the workshop facilitator role had not been adequately communicated by the team and requested a meeting with team members to discuss and clarify DTA and its goals. There was also some planning for the following week's workshop which would involve resource people from a New York Responsive Education school.

The sixth workshop was part of a series of events linking Reel School's Open Corridor program with open corridor resource people from a New York Responsive Education site. Chitra had visited the Reel third floor teachers in early April of 1976. That visit had led to the district-wide Open Corridor workshop held on May 18, at which the third floor teachers and Chitra had made presentations to representative teachers and principals from District 21.

Yvonne and Barbara had visited the New York sites in mid-October, at which time they had met the Teacher Assister who later was invited to the sixth workshop. They also visited two of her schools, including the one from which the Parent Coordinator was invited also to participate at the workshop. Yvonne had attended a New York Region seminar where she heard the Chairperson of the Black Parents Union at one of the funded site schools give an effective presentation on parents' expectations of teachers. Barbara and Frances, in attending another New York seminar in January 1977, used the occasion to continue planning and exchanging information in preparation for the upcoming workshop, which would involve New York funded site participants, with Chitra, and directly with the two New York resource visitors by telephone.

In early February Chitra again visited Reel when she was in town for an unrelated conference. At that point she talked informally with Reel staff about the upcoming workshop and how the Open Corridor program was going. Barbara reported that the visit was good because it reinforced links with the New York site for the Open Corridor staff. Carl reported that the visit was inspiring for the Open Corridor teachers. Chitra had said that she was impressed with what she observed at Reel.

Following the workshop, through correspondence initiated by the Black Parents Union Chairperson, a "sister school" relationship between the New York school and Reel was formalized with the sanction of the two principals. When the principal of Reel attended a New York seminar on April 25 on "The Principal, Key Decision Maker in School Problem Solving," she had an opportunity to visit some New York funded sites, including the school from which the two workshop resource people had come. In reporting back to her teachers about the seminar and her visit, she referred to the activities she had observed as Reel's "sister school." Her visit supported the Reel Open Corridor teachers' desire to take field trips so that they could experience directly how other schools dealt with common problems, and specifically to see other open corridor type programs functioning.

The sixth workshop was a special ninety minute session designed to utilize guest speakers with experience in developing community resources to enhance open corridor educational programs. Besides the Open Corridor teacher, the Principal, and eight parents, the entire team was represented, except for the Region Director who did not attend any of the Open Corridor workshop series, other than to stop by on a couple of mornings. A consultant to the team, hired to facilitate the team's interactions with each other, was also present to observe the sixth workshop. The parents and teachers divided into two separate ninety minute sessions, one held in the morning and the other in the afternoon. The guests shared the presentation at each session. They brought literature to hand out and scrapbook materials which were circulated among workshop participants. Both the teacher Assister and the Chairperson of the Black Parents Union for the school used a question and answer format.

The written evaluations of the event done by teachers were overwhelmingly positive, stressing as most helpful the guests, especially the Parent Coordinator, sharing their experiences and suggestions, recognizing similar problems between the sites, and the participation of Reel parents in the event. One respondent also mentioned hearing about the children's input into the New York program. Only two participants mentioned aspects which were not helpful: needing more concrete examples of "good Open Corridor procedures;" that all the Open Corridor teachers were not together in one session; and needing more time for activities where teachers get directions and assistance.

Many of the topics suggested for further exploration had to do with how to involve parents as resources and in support of the Open Corridor program. These included parent-teacher communication, teacher involvement in parents' activities, and a "Parent Room" at the school. Also mentioned were "seeing a good open corridor program first hand," and relationships between teachers.

In the Study Team interviews of Open Corridor teachers conducted in April, many teachers specifically referred to the linkage events bringing resource people from the Iroquois City and New York sites as being especially helpful. The teachers felt their understanding of open corridor was increased by bringing in experts with concrete information, putting them in interactive contact with others who were "doing the same thing." Some specific responses were:

> [They] made us aware of the problems involved [in Open Corridor] and what can be done about them.
>
> The speakers were most helpful. They let me know how important parents are and some things we can do to involve them.
>
> Talking to [the New York resource people] made us more realistic. I can see it'll probably take us five years.
>
> I thought that the sessions with [the Iroquois City resource person] and the two visitors from New York . . . were very helpful. Those sessions made one stop and think of what really has to be done here.

Another teacher stated that the team made Open Corridor a reality by showing that it really does exist elsewhere.

The seventh workshop/meeting, on March 15, was conducted by Barbara, and Carl. While the meeting was primarily designed to be a response to a request coming from the role questioning of the March 1 workshop/meeting to provide an explanation of CNS, DTA, the Study Team, and the role of technical assistance at Reel, some other agenda items were covered first. First the teachers gave feedback on the March 8 workshop/seminar. Second, Barbara asked the teachers for direction on who among them would chair the next workshop. The assistance team was still expecting the Open Corridor teachers to begin assuming more responsibility and leadership in coordinating and facilitating its own workshops. The team had indicated from the beginning of the workshop series that while it would carry out the first six workshops, it expected the teachers to assume responsibility for subsequent workshops. No teachers, however, stepped forward to assume these responsibilities. Third, the team having recently been asked to make a presentation on Open Corridor at a District 20 and 21 inservice meeting on March 24, then asked the teachers if they wished to participate in that event. There was little time to prepare a presentation and the teachers refused. Fourth, The Goals Committee reported it had not met to develop goals.

Providing Assistance at the District Level. The three district level workshops described earlier were important routes of entry to the team's local school assistance work. After making entry at the local school level, however, the team maintained ongoing relationships with the District Superintendent and his ISS staff, continuing regularly to exchange information about the team, and activities going on at both the local school and district wide levels. The team also continued to provide some assistance at the district level, doing less during the period when it was most intensivelv involved first at Carlson and then at Reel, but picking up again in the spring of 1977.

In supporting its ongoing relationships and the face to face exchanges of information during visits both at the district and local school levels, the team, especially Frances, made frequent use of telephone calls and letters. The letters had the following pattern of characteristics and purposes.

1. The letters were usually brief--one page long.
2. They functioned as documents confirming interactions and/or anticipating future interactions.
3. They suggested continuing interactions with the addressees while conveying that the team's information exchange processes also involved others in the district and at the schools.
4. In mentioning events occurring at CNS and in DTA, they established that there were conditions and occurrences arising from the DTA project and CNS needs that placed the team in a somewhat comparable position to school people who must deal with local school, district, and central office conditions and occurrences.

The assistance activities carried out by the team at the district level were either responses to specific requests for assistance or information from district people, events to open possible entry routes to local schools, DTA linkage activities, or combinations of the above. Besides planning and carrying out some assistance activities at the district level after local school entry, Frances, and sometimes other DTA staff, continued to meet, although less frequently, with the District Superintendent and ISS, both at the district office and occasionally at CNS.

One district level event relating to linkage occurred early in the assistance process. The Directors of the Documentation Team and the New York Region accompanied Frances to a district ISS meeting on April 26. Time had been scheduled on the agenda for "Center for New Schools." Frances talked briefly about the DTA photo gallery on some of the NIE funded sites that had already been taken to the district office and left there. She introduced Steve and Terry to those ISS members who had not already met them at the linkage luncheon on April 7. Responding to Frances' request, the District Superintendent then told the group that the School Board was considering closing down some school facilities and restructuring the programs in some others. He said that he had mentioned this to Frances to see what kinds of information DTA had on the ways some of the school programs might be restructured in District 21 to meet the needs of students in adjacent district as well as to find ways to continue using the facilities within the district being considered for closing. Terry told the group that a similar set of circumstances had occurred in New York about a year previously. She said she would like to share, possibly through Frances, some information DTA had about how the New York schools dealt with the issue. Steve offered to write up some brief descriptions of the nine funded sites being studied by DTA for the ISS team members.

On May 5 Steve and Terry sent to the District Superintendent and District 21 "Capsule Accounts" of activities at the nine funded sites. Expressing thanks, in an accompanying letter, for letting them participate in the ISS meeting, Steve and Terry said,

> We were both impressed with the seriousness, commitment, and expertise that your group demonstrates as they go about their business. . . As one step in supporting you in your project to design a special program for the Upper Grade Centers, we want to share with you very brief accounts of our nine sites.

In the letter they also gave some additional information about the sites and DTA.

Besides Frances' frequent attendance at regular ISS meetings, members of the team occasionally met with ISS members for special purposes. For instance, on June 21, 1976, they met at the district office to preview a film for an upcoming Peer Tutoring workshop with the teachers and college students who would be supervising the student tutors during the summer program. Several times during the assistance process the District Superintendent and ISS members met with the team at CNS, or stopped by to visit. One instance was on November 22, 1976, when the District Superintendent and ISS members were invited to CNS to meet with a CNS consultant to discuss testing, citywide policy and procedures, and implications for District 21. In addition, the District Superintendent and ISS members were regularly invited to attend special assistance events occurring at the local school level, and sometimes were able to attend. For instance, the District Superintendent and two ISS members were able, on separate occasions, to visit the Reel morning workshops.

On April 9, 1976, Frances had made a brief presentation on DTA at an ISS meeting, including a discussion of her role and the role of the Study Team representative who had accompained her. At this meeting the issue of reaching a formal agreement about the terms of the Chicago Region team's work in District 21 arose. On the following March 23, at a Chicago Board of Education meeting, the terms of the team's involvement in District 21 were discussed and a final contract agreement was passed by the Board. The contract covered the period of time through DTA's Phase II. It named the people who were doing the assistance, committed them to approximately two days (average) a week of direct assistance, stated that the contract involved no direct cash transfer, and accepted the research and internal study aspects of DTA work.

The team's participation in the Districts 20 and 21 inservice session held on March 24, 1977, marked the beginning of a resurgence of team activity at the district level. In anticipation of the inservice session Yvonne helped Barbara prepare a slide show on the Reel Open Corridor program. Barbara wrote a one page handout, using a question and answer format, with such questions as "What is (the) Open Corridor?" "What is the teacher's role in the Open Corridor community?" "How can parents contribute to an Open Corridor program?" In the Open Corridor seminar, which was one of approximately twenty-five seminars at the inservice carried out by district staff and consultants, Barbara gave a talk on open corridor philosophy and practice, which included discussion of the assistance team's work at Reel. Carl assisted with the slide presentation and the question and answer portion of the inservice session.

On April 13, Carl, Frances, and Ilena represented the team at a district principals' meeting. Besides the District Superintendent and three ISS members, approximately forty principals, including the principal of Reel, and several assistant principals, master teachers, and adjustment teachers were also present. As part of the meeting the assistance team members gave an overview of CNS, DTA, and the Chicago Region assistance team.

In May, Carl represented the team in making five presentations to different groups within the district and its surrounding area. On May 6, Carl presented his paper (Boyd, 1977) "You Don't Have to Be a Star," to the District 21 Parents Council. Between the 19th and the 31st he met with parents at a District 21 Academic Center, parents and teachers at a District 21 Upper Grade Center, parents at an elementary school, and a class of 12 to 14 year old students at the same Academic Center where he had spoken twelve days earlier.

District 21 was sponsoring three summer programs for the summer of 1977, including a reading center program to number ten reading centers. At the request of the District Superintendent, invitations were sent to all of the reading teachers who would be in the summer program to attend a workshop on May 20. The ISS had asked the Chicago team to collaborate with them in planning and carrying out the event.

Thirty-two teachers attended the workshop. The main event which was conducted by the assistance team was an activity called "take a closer look." Participants were asked to list the behaviors they observed more frequently in their students. Teachers then shared their lists with each other and discussed the pros and cons of the different behaviors listed. They quickly discovered that behaviors which some had thought of as negative others thought of as strengths, or desirable behaviors. Examples of behaviors with these characteristics are: "talks a lot," "aggressive." After having looked at the information listed by the participants in the six small groups, Frances, Carl, and Ilena asked the recorder from each group to report and pointed out similarities and differences between groups. While still in the whole group, the teachers discussed the list from small groups further, by giving examples of how these behaviors and teachers' responses to them get played out in the classroom.

While the teachers did not all agree in the values they attributed to different behaviors in students, thirty-one of the thirty-two teachers present said they wanted to do more work on "cultural strengths."

The Summer Institute The culminating activity of the assistance process carried out by the Chicago Region during the time frame considered in this paper was the Summer Institute held on July 16 and 17, 1977. The Institute was planned and carried out by the Chicago Region team with the support of the District Superintendent and ISS. The Institute directly focused on the Region's organizing theme of "building from cultural strengths."

Planning for the Institute took into consideration three major issues: (1) How to get maximum impact. (2) How to set a tone which would draw people into the spirit of the workshop. (3) How to build on teachers' experiences to communicate experientially the idea of "building on cultural strengths."

Brenda Harris, a woman from the Carolina Sea Islands and a friend of Frances from the Black Child Development Institute, was invited to lead the first part of the workshop. She led the group in singing familiar songs from South Carolina, doing rhymes, telling stories, leading games played by children. She assumed that people remembered the songs from their childhood. Participants not only remembered the songs, but remembered different variations depending on where they grew up. She also assumed that people knew how to relate to each other in a group, based on the way they had been raised. In referring to people entering or leaving the groups' circular arrangement, she would say from time to time, "You know what to do when someone leaves." She did not explain what to do, but the group responded appropriately. Drawing on songs, stories, and games in counterpoint, she introduced some African songs and games. Participants soon started bringing up their own versions of games and some new ones.

The process during this part of the workshop was marked by interdependent group work and the opportunity for anyone in the group to draw from their background and move into a leadership role by suggesting games and songs and introducing them to the group. The activity also combined participating in the "here and now" with evoking a sense of other places and other times, modeled teaching techniques, and provided ideas for working with children.

In the next part of the workshop Carl led the group through different kinds of music coming from the Black heritage: gospel, blues, jazz, children's songs. Again those present participated and recognized the music, allowing them to realize that all this music was within their experience and part of their heritage.

Following Carl's presentation, consultant Charles M. discussed the value of cultural strengths and their maintenance. Charles M. used a series of exercises, including asking participants to (1) define culture, (2) draw a shield (individually) (similar to a British Crest) that had symbols on it they were representative of their individual strengths and share the results in the whole group, (3) think of a television show seen within the last year on the Black experience that reinforced these strengths. Most participants could think of only one; some none. Charles M. asked, "Where are you going to get these strengths reinforced in the media?"

Next, Frances showed the movie, Lonnie's Day, a day in the life of a child living in a big city housing project. Frances asked participants to discuss Lonnie's strengths and compare the strengths shown in the film with the ones they had listed for themselves. Most participants said that the movie demonstrated the same strengths they had listed as taking place in the homes of children. Some of the teachers then concluded that most of the strengths were the same for themselves and for Lonnie.

Other parts of the workshop included a discussion between the participants and a woman who was invited to talk about her experiences as one of the first women to make headway in the field of aviation. Dorothy (a Technical Assistance Specialist who had joined the team in June) developed the format and introduced the presentation. In so doing, she reminded the participants that they could carry out, by inviting people from the community to talk to students, a similar presentation in their own classrooms. After the presentation Dorothy encouraged the workshop participants to ask questions that they thought their students would ask. When the question and answer period had been completed, Dorothy showed slides of the community in which the schools represented by the participants are located. While showing the slides Dorothy suggested various activities that the students might do as part of their classroom activities. The activities suggested by Dorothy included students interviewing people who had lived in the community for a number of years, and/or tracing their own family history by interviewing members of their families. This presentation by Dorothy was then followed by a slide presentation by Frances that she has developed to highlight, by looking back into history, the cultural strengths of Black people.

At the end of the two days participants were asked to fill out evaluation froms on the event. As participants completed the form and handed them to Ilena, several stated that the experience had been enjoyable and they they were going to share what they had learned with the people back at their schools. Some of the participants also inquired aobut borrowing the slide tape on cultural strengths in order to show it to others at their schools. Some of the participants thanked the team members and said that they were looking forward to similar activities in the future. (Their written comments are presented in the effects section of this paper.)

Exchanging Information

Frances remained the primary channel for information exchanges with district personnel, the Carlson head teacher, and the DTA project's Leadership Team throughout the providing assistance stage. Barbara became the primary channel for information exchanges with the staffs of Carlson and Reel, as well as the principal of Reel. Yvonne became the primary channel for information exchanges around linkage with DTA's Documentation Team, including the nine site researchers and funded sites participants who took part in the Region's linkage activities. Carl became an important channel for information exchanges with teachers at Reel, and the primary channel for information exchanges with parents in District 21 and some nearby districts. The most extensive information exchanges were with certain district personnel, the principal of Reel, the head teacher of Carlson, certain teachers with whom Barbara and Carl were able to establish special rapport, and other DTA staff.

Information exchanges within the Region team were frequent and reflected the gatekeeper roles assumed by Frances, Barbara, and Yvonne. While the different team members all affirmed the building from cultural strengths organizing theme of the Region, conflicts arose and increased, especially in the spring of 1977, about how best to carry out the Region's work. The conflicts reflected, in part, the gatekeeping perspectives of Frances, Barbara, and Yvonne.

Activities that were used by the Region to support the information exchange process included:

1. Telephone conversations with the District Superintendent, ISS members, the principal of Reel, and the head teacher of Carlson.

2. Letters to formalize and/or lay groundwork for information exchanged in conversations and meetings.
3. Formal interviews designed to gather information systematically to guide the overall work of the team as well as to help establish ongoing relationships with both district and local school people.
4. Invitations to district level people resulting in their participation in some local school formal assistance events and in local school representatives to district level assistance events.
5. Videotapes, photographs, and slides as documentation of assistance events and as means to introduce information at events.
6. Special resource people, materials designed for specific meetings, and field trips. (Activities in 5 and 6 were designed to make information concrete and related to the work of the local school people.)
7. Written evaluations, debriefing meetings, and feedback interviews to provide specific structures for obtaining useful information.
8. Team members' availability to follow up on specific requests for additional information.

Some information exchange processes were designed to support entry and building relationships. The activities tended to be consistent with the tailoring model.

Distinguishing of Roles

While the Eugene/Oakland team started its work with largely undifferentiated roles which became more differentiated as the concentration of assistance work shifted to the local school level, the Chicago Region team started with deliberately differentiated roles, with some pressure to reduce the differentiation as the work progressed. Frances limited her involvement in actually providing assistance at the local school level as one way of making both her role and the roles of the TA Specialists clear. Other team members viewed that as unreasonable because of the large amount of work that needed to be done at the local school level.

The gatekeeper roles emerged early in the assistance process. When Carl joined the team, bringing his own style, the gatekeepers were firmly in place.

About halfway through the workshop series at Reel, confusion and misunderstanding between team members and some teachers arose regarding the actual and appropriate role of the TA Specialists. The TA Specialist roles were both clarified and modified as the assistance process went on. In addition, Barbara and Carl, having different styles of work and experience bases, experienced some difficulty in differentiating and negotiating with each other their individual roles as TA Specialists.

Building Relationships

Providing ongoing face-to-face assistance by a technical assistance team requires the establishment and maintenance of relationships on many levels: within the team itself, between the team and its organizational support base, between team members and district level personnel, between team members and both local school administrators and their staff, and sometimes between team members and parents and other members of the larger school community. In addition, the relationships which exist or develop between and within different school constituencies can have a significant impact on the process of providing assistance. In the case of the Chicago Region, the assistance team also facilitated the establishment of relationships between assistance site participants and funded site participants.

While the Chicago Region established relationships on all of these levels, it experiences some difficulty at two levels. First, the different perspectives which related to roles within the team, reflected the different gatekeeping functions carried out by team members, produced tension and conflict within the team itself. Second, maintaining productive relationships simultaneously with both local school administrators and teachers required time and sensitivity, and the team experienced a certain amount of difficulty in this area. At Carlson, the fact that the staff was new and had not yet had time to establish ongoing supportive relationships among themselves worked against their comfortably allowing other staff members to make key diagnoses for their students (as the unmodified Evanston model introduced by the team required). This may well have contributed to the teachers' refusal to embrace enthusiastically the Evanston model.

The Chicago Region team informed people at all levels that it was building and maintaining relationships simultaneously with people at the district level, in different schools, and in different roles within the particular school community. The question arises for further consideration within DTA: How broadly can simultaneous relationships be developed by an assistance team without diluting effectiveness? Can a small team work simultaneously and effectively in several, even two, schools?

Identifying and Making Links

In carrying out its DTA linkage function, the major thrust of the Chicago Region was to look for organizing ideas at the funded sites which related to activities already going on at the assistance sites (e.g., open corridor programs in New York, open education in Iroquois City, restructuring the use of district school facilities at funded sites) and/or ideas which could help solve problems identified by assistance site participants (e.g., parent participation at Los Diablos, peer tutoring at a New York site). Where possible the team sought to identify or ask the funded site to identify individuals who could recreate that idea in other settings for Chicago groups. In the cases of Chitra, Mrs. Smith, Jean Taylor, and the Teacher Advisor and Parent Coordinator from an Open Corridor school, the team arranged to have funded sites representatives visit Chicago and make face to face presentations, using visual and written materials to supplement and assist in concretizing the presentation.

The organizing ideas presented by these resource people were embedded in the lore of the funded sites. (See Holmes, 1977a) From observing the events at which funded sites representatives made presentations to Chicago school groups, some generalizations can be drawn:

1. People serving as resources can contain and handle more complexity than can documentary resources.

2. People serving as resources can directly consider the particular areas of concern and interest which assistance site participants identify during the encounter, while still checking back against and bringing forward when necessary the unifying context of the whole setting which they represent.

3. People serving as resources of information can establish relationships with site participants as well as convey information. The relationships can be important facilitation structures to open up, focus, and increase interest in the information being exchanged.

4. Because building and maintaining human relationships always involves some degree of awareness of the differences as well as the similarities between individual people, the introduction of specific real life educational models by human participants establishes a context for sorting out the differences as well as the similarities between the model setting and the setting considering using or adapting the model.

In carrying out a series of linkage activities to support the Reel Open Corridor program, an interactive relationship developed between the Chicago Region team and the New York Region, especially with Chitra, the Site Researcher for the NIE funded REsponsive Education site. Both the assistance team and Chitra took initiatives in planning and carrying out linkage activities in District 21 and at Reel. Recognizing that each assistance site must build solutions to the problems in tackles from its own strengths, and not wanting to impose a particular open education kit or package on the assistance site, the team arranged for the presentation by Jean Taylor as a way to assist the site participants to consider more than one open education model in working to build its own Open Corridor program.

Using Materials

The Chicago Region used materials for a number of purposes and from a number of sources to support its assistance work.

Both assistance team members and special resource people used materials to introduce and help make concrete to site participants ideas and groups concerned with issues and problems which assistance site participants were identifying. The team used photographs, slides, videotapes, movies, music, and written handouts. Resource people brought slides, videotape, poetry, and samples of children's writing and pictures, as well as written handouts to support their presentations. The team also developed during the winter of 1977 a videotape on the Reel Open Corridor program to use both within DTA and as a means to introduce the open corridor idea to other groups.

In supporting the development of the Carlson screening program and the Reel Open Corridor program, the team helped gather various materials both from within the schools and from other sources to support the programs. The team's frequent use of written handouts in the Reel Open Corridor workshop series prompted the principal to ask Barbara and Carl to be sure to give her copies of any "goodies" handed out in the weekly sessions for a notebook that she was keeping. The team developed and used materials, such as a slide show, to introduced information and stimulate response around the team's organizing theme of building from cultural strengths.

Checking for Usefulness

The team established and used several different formal tools and structures to support checking for usefulness of their assistance activities:

1. Formal interviews conducted at both local school and district levels.

2. Evaluation forms for participants after most major workshops, including all linkage workshops.

3. Special debriefing meeting after team members and school people collaborated to carry out events such as workshops.

4. Conversations of team members with Study Team representatives.

5. Checking for usefulness of their work as a regular part of the agenda at weekly team meetings.

6. Telephone conversations with site participants.

7. Inviting district people to local school assistance events, and local representatives to district assistance events, giving the assistance team the opportunity to hear their direct reactions on the usefulness of these events.

8. Use of time before Reel Open Corridor workshops began for those already present to evaluate agenda and suggest changes.

9. Use of people as resources, partly to allow site participants to check on their own the usefulness of ideas to others.

10. The assumption of gatekeeper roles by Frances, Barbara, and Yvonne, which insured that usefulness questions would continually be asked around (1) team theme and district needs (Frances), (2) DTA linkage needs (Yvonne), and (3) the needs of local school participants (Barbara).

Informal structures to check for usefulness which were employed extensively were brief chats and longer conversations between team members and site participants, and ongoing conversations between team members. Although all team members visited the local school sites, Barbara and Carl spent the most time in the local schools and therefore were in the strongest positions to make direct usefulness observations about the full range of the team's work in those settings.

After experiencing considerable frustration in introducing the Evanston screening model at Carlson, the team took pains to introduce more than one model, and those more flexibly, at Reel. A special concern of the team throughout its assistance work was to try not to create ongoing dependency on the assistance team by site participants. The team emphasis was on the usefulness of activities in supporting and building problem solving capacity in local schools rather than on solving schools' problems for them.

One instance where developing problem solving capacity in site participants was not the primary purpose of a major assistance event was the presentation by Mrs. Smith at Lucille. The team's primary purpose was to carry out a linkage activity. The event was not part of any sustained assistance work at Lucille and, while it was well received by the participants, did not produce observable changes in the school.

The CNS tradition of trying to link educational research and practice and asking how useful its efforts were to school people, and especially to children in schools, influenced how the team checked for usefulness. Also, the regular contact with others in the DTA organization increased pressure on the team to ask usefulness questions about how DTA issues and purposes were being addressed in the work. The Region team, the DTA project, and CNS were all in the process of discovering and refining assumptions and strategies about how the total technical assistance process actually works. Consequently, usefulness question were often directed at clarifying what effective technical assistance is, what structures and activities are necessary to support it, and what steps are necessary to effect it.

Withdrawal from Assistance

Withdrawal from assistance at Carlson occurred during the Chicago Region team's Phase II work. During the entry stage at Carlson the team had made some efforts to interest site participants in having the team provide some assistance with enhancing parent participation in the school. The verbal agreement reached between the Region Director and the Carlson Child Parent Center principal, however, was confined to an understanding that the team would provide assistance in carrying out a training program to prepare the staff to screen four year olds. When the team had carried out its planned steps to train Carlson staff to use the Evanston screening program it decided to withdraw from active assistance at the site, although it maintained some contacts.

Informing the district and formalizing the withdrawal, Frances wrote a letter to the District Superintendent on November 18, attaching a document describing the process and activities the team had used in planning and implementing the training program. In her letter she stated the Region's hope that "the screening of the four year olds will be completed early on, so that children's needs can be addressed as soon as possible." She went on to state that the team had completed the training program. She also stated in the letter that the team's work at Reel was "going very well. [Our] efforts there will increase."

When the team decided to withdraw from Carlson, it expressed disappointment at the lack of motivation on the part of the Carlson staff to mobilize energy around the screening program. Team members also expressed the point of view that the internal dynamics of the Center had made it difficult to work effectively with the screening committee.

In contrast, the Carlson head teacher, who was interviewed by a Study Team consultant in June 1977, saw the failure of the staff's response to meet the team's expectations not as an indication of any lack of interest in screening, but rather in the unsuitability of the Evanston procedures for the Carlson setting. The parttime availability of the support staff had made the simultaneous coordination of six screening stations extremely difficult at Carlson. Consequently, the screening process was long and drawn out and by the time the results reached the classroom teachers they were not useful any more. The head teacher added that the school was using a modified version of the screening program which they had adapted from the work of the assistance team.

This perspective was supported by the Reel principal who reported to the Study Team in June that in her view,

> The instrument wasn't used extensively. The Carlson staff found that it used too much time and that the schedule of administration was not suitable . . . it took too long.

Several circumstances may have contributed to the failure of the Carlson training program to meet the assistance team's expectations.

1. The Child-Parent Center was newly opening and thus had a group of people working together for the first time who had not had time to get to know each other well.
2. The team members were also a new group getting to know each other and carrying out new roles. Although some had done consulting work, none of the team members had done sustained technical assistance work before.
3. The school was in the process of identifying and establishing its relationships within the total Reel school complex.
4. The team was under pressure to establish credibility rapidly as an effective technical assistance group, without making school participants dependent on their services.
5. Individual school participants needed to establish and/or to increase their own credibility by demonstrating to the team and the district that they already were doing and/or considering some of the things the team suggested it might help with, such as identifying students' strengths and weaknesses.

An interesting paradox may be seen in the assistance process at Carlson and its aftermath. The assistance team withdrew rapidly from Carlson after providing the assistance it had agreed to do, and expressed some disappointment around the site's response to their work there. The site participants, however, as a result of the team's introduction of a screening program at their school, were able to go ahead on their own later in the year to develop and use the modification of the model the team had introduced which met their needs. Perhaps one way to succeed in providing assistance in support of developing problem solving capacity is to "fail."

The questions developed under the frame categories of the Eugene/Oakland Withdrawal from Assistance section of this paper were designed to be of use to the Chicago Region also when it moves to withdraw from providing sustained assistance at local school sites.

CHAPTER IV: EFFECTS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The effects of a single act can be complicated and elusive. The effects of complex events and ongoing activities can be even more so. Furthermore, even where effects can be described, the relationship of those effects to future acts and events is a matter for speculation. Therefore, the effects described below are confined to observed areas where some change occurred in local school settings during the assistance process. This section does not attempt either to trace the complex routes of specific cause or to predict future events from them. In addition to the patterns of effect suggested below, many possible effects have been suggested in the preceding section on the assistance process.

The underlying, complex issue with which the DTA project is engaging is how can local schools be helped to increase their organizational problem solving capacity for the purpose of improving the quality of education for urban public school students. Therefore, although the total process of providing assistance to urban schools also requires attention to other kinds of effects, this section focuses on discussing how the activities of the two DTA technical assistance regions during Phase II contributed to changes occurring in the problem solving capacities of certain Oakland and Chicago public schools. This section identifies areas where some change has occurred which may be considered as aspects of a school community's potential resources for problem solving.

It is not possible to attribute clear cause or credit for these areas of change to either the assistance teams alone or site participants alone. This is because of the highly interactive nature of the assistance process, because the assistance teams generally tried to respond to needs identified by site participants, and because many initiatives, modifications, acts and ideas were introduced by site participants. Therefore, the effects discussed below are offered as changes resulting from the ongoing interaction in the local school context between the assistance teams and local site participants.

The Study Team has identified eight resource areas which a school community can draw from in working to solve its problems. Some of these are structural and some are experiential. The areas include:

1. The physical environment.
2. Organizational structures within the school community.
3. Roles of participants.
4. Access to information and assistance resources.
5. Skills and talents of participants.
6. Tools which participants can use, including questions.
7. Real life and conceptual models to which participants have been exposed.
8. The combined experience and information base of participants.

Changes occurred to some extent in all of these areas, including the support, use, or modification of some existing structures, at local schools in both Oakland and Chicago during the assistance process. In considering the impact of the assistance process on the different resource areas at local schools, specific examples refer the reader back to the description and analysis of the assistance process contained in the previous section of the paper. Neither the permanence nor the long range impact of these changes can be assessed at this point.

Changes in the Physical Environment

These changes include the introduction or new assemblage of materials. Many written materials were introduced in both regions during the assistance process. In addition, the use of the entire old building at Reel for the Open Corridor program, and the introduction of open corridor learning materials and screening materials were significant changes.

Organizational Structures within the Schools

These include the formation of committees and planning groups, as well as the activite support, use, or modification of already existing structures. In the case of the Eugene/Oakland Region, it worked through and supported the SISC structure in each school. The Chicago Region influenced and worked through the reorganization of teachers at Reel into an open corridor program.

Roles of Participants

These include changes in the roles of assistance site participants, including how already existing roles are perceived and used, and the creation of new roles. The "Parents Brigade" at Hazelwood was a new role at that school. At Reel the role of open corridor teacher was expanded and clarified and came to include more teachers during the assistance process. In both regions, the role of the principal (or head teacher) was supported within the school setting by the fact of the teams working through the principal (or head teacher) in each school.

Access to Information and Assistance Resources

These include information and resources both within the school community context, including district level resources, and those outside that context. Participants at Reel established direct access to Jean Taylor, New York Open Corridor representatives, and to a nearby teacher center. Within both regions and at all schools participants gained direct access to the technical assistance team.

Skills and Talents of Participants

These include changes in skills and changes in the use of already existing skills and talents of individual site participants. Some of the areas where skills or changes in use of skills were observed were: (a) use of photography to document school events, (b) recording small group discussions in the context of larger meetings or workshops, (c) chairing/facilitating meetings and group activities, (d) identifying and sharing useful materials, (e) organizing activities, and (f) interpreting between key individuals and groups. While assistance team members sometimes filled or created for themselves interpreter roles, two principals reported a positive change in their interpretation of teachers' perspectives as a result of the assistance process.

Tools which Participants Can Use, Including Questions

These changes include the introduction to the school communities of materials, evaluation instruments, concepts, questions and group process techniques and other kinds of assistance events (such as workshops, retreats, seminars) and techniques which in their particular form are new to at least some site participants, and may be used again or modified by site participants. The introduction of specific tools, models and information to the school settings stimulated the asking of certain questions by site participants (e.g., What is open corridor?, How should parents participate in the life of the school?). As a result of the teams' activities, some questions were pushed farther than they might have been otherwise.

Real Life and Conceptual Models to which Participants Have Been Exposed

These changes include not only the introduction of external operational models (e.g., a New York Responsive Education program, the Los Diablos site, the Chicago school, the Evanston screening program) and conceptual models (school within a school), but also experiences by site participants relating them to the circumstances of the assistance site. Site participants, especially at Reel, but also to a certain extent at Hazelwood, had opportunities to experience how organizing and energizing ideas had influenced other school settings. In addition, site participants were exposed to the kinds of assistance roles used by team members and the people as resources which they brought to the schools. These role models could be used again, modified for use, or avoided by site participants or other outside resource people they seek

The Combined Experience and Information Base of Participants

As a result of the assistance process the combined experience and information base of site participants expanded and changed. Interaction events occurred around and through the assistance events which were carried out. These included:

a. Interactions between and within different subgroups within the school community (administrators and teachers, parents and school staff, district and school staff, teachers and teachers).

b. Interactions between site participants and representatives from other educational settings (all outside resource people, including assistance team members).

c. Interactions with documents and materials, including those from and about other school sites.

The information exchanged, relationships developed, and experiences shared in these interactions expanded the pools of resources from which the particular school communities can draw in working to solve their problems. While this experience and information base is vast and difficult to manipulate, it may be the primary resource from which site participants draw in carrying out problem solving activities.

CHAPTER V: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ISSUES

The role of the Study team within the DTA context is not to pronounce final judgement on the usefulness or value of acts and strategies as they relate to providing assistance to urban schools. Rather, the Study team's role is to observe and represent for others as much as possible of the process, context, and effects of providing assistance within the DTA technical assistance regions. In carrying out its work the Study Team has identified patterns, ideas, and issues which emerge from the assistance work, and considering them within the contexts which give them meaning, offers them as tools for the project as a whole to use in analyzing past and planning future work. The issues presented here, organized by stage are offered as tools for the project to consider using in analyzing Phase II and planning Phase III work.

The foregoing exploration of the processes of providing school assistance by two different teams within the DTA Project has raised a number of questions regarding the relationship between assistance processes and effects. Following are the questions which we now see as necessary to consider in the process of continuing to understand our experience in the last phase of our work and in preparing for further work. First, questions are raised with respect to the stages of rendering assistance in schools: the organization of the assistance team, the establishment of entry and preparation for withdrawal, and providing assistance. Second, questions regarding the following cross-cutting issues are raised: issues of conflict and balance, issues about the facilitator role, and issues about linkage.

Organization of Team

Organizing and energizing power of a team theme

It is necessary for an assistance group to have an organizing theme? Why?

How does an organizing theme support a group on providing ongoing, face-to-face technical assistance?

How does an organizing theme limit what a particular assistance group can do?

Previous training and experience of team members, including shared experience base with intended recipients of the assistance*

What specific kinds of training are useful to technical assisters in carrying out their work? How?

How can skills traditionally associated with researchers be useful to technical assisters? What skills?

How can skills traditionally associated with educational practitioners be useful to technical assisters? What skills?

How does a shared experience base support a team doing assistance work in a particular setting? How does it hinder or limit providing assistance?

For what kinds of assistance is what kind of a shared experience base helpful or even necessary? How? For what kinds of assistance is what kind of a shared experience base not helpful, or even limiting? How?

Differentiation of roles within the assistance team

What problems can be encourntered when roles are minimally differentiated? What advantages?

What problems can be encountered when roles are sharply differentiated? What advantages?

For what kinds of assistance is what kind and extend of differentiation of roles within the team structure advantageous?

*Shared experience base encompasses a number of features including shared and ascribed attributes and circumstances as well as whether relevant experiences are shared within the team, between team members and members of assistance sites, or both.

Kinds of roles

What kinds of roles, either individual or shared, need to be identified and filled to carry out effective technical assistance within the DTA context? (These can be considered around functions: leadership of team including representing team theme, linkage between research and practice, building and maintaining relationships with district personnel and principals, on site assistance, developing materials, analyzing the team's work, etc.)

In what ways can the development of gatekeeping functions around team roles be useful to the assistance process? In what ways can gatekeepers hinder or limit the assistance process?

How can team roles be defined, developed, and carried out to deal effectively with the problem of overload of work?

Organization of team to support the assistance work as a whole

How can a team leader effectively support the work of a team as a whole and in its parts?

How can assistance team members support each other in their different formal and informal roles?

How can team members coordinate their different activities and keep each other informed of their activities and needs so as to support the work?

Establishing Entry and Preparing for Withdrawal

Entry questions

What kinds of questions can assistance teams expect site participants to be considering during entry negotiations?

What kinds of questions is it useful for an assistance team to consider during entry?

What characteristics of a potential assistance site are likely to contribute to productive assistance work?

What needs of the assistance team need to be addressed by questions during the entry process?

How do the team's entry questions represent different aspects of the team's agenda?

What kinds of and how much information about the site in its context and the team context need to be exchanged before formalizing the terms of the assistance to be carried out?

Negotiating entry

What kinds of skills, experience, and contacts are useful to the individual(s) who plan and negotiate entry?

Who on the team should negotiate entry? What impact can there be on the team and on the work if the negotiators of entry and providers of assistance are different individuals?

Are there other useful ways to enter local schools besides through the local school district?

How does the establishment of relationships with key site participants during entry affect the rest of the assistance process? What roles within the school or district are important to consider in building initial relationships?

Formalizing the terms of assistance

How are formal site agreements useful? How specific should they be? What are advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to formal site agreement?

How are informal site agreements useful? What are advantages and disadvantages to different approaches to informal site agreements?

What issues should an assistance team consider addressing in a site agreement?

What preliminary steps appear to be necessary before a formal assistance agreement can be made?

Providing Assistance

Issues of Readiness and Timing

Timing of the provision of information by the team about its organizational support base, DTA, team roles, and purposes

How much information is given when?

Is it useful to think of stages of revealing this information? If so, what stages are useful?

Demonstrating expertise of team and its members

How can team members demonstrate that they can assist school people (in the classroom, through workshops, and at the district level, etc.)? What timing and extent of demonstration be useful?

How can the team deal with the issue of such demonstrations possibly implying a denial of expertise among site participants?

Assisting participants who do not want assistance

For example: If a principal asks a team to do something with a group of teachers and some of the teachers say or or demonstrate they do not want that assistance or feel they do not need it, what can and should the team do?

Identifying signs of readiness in school settings

What signs of readiness can be identified for different assistance purposes?

How are signs of readiness identified?

Timing of off site visits and field trips as an assistance technique

What are the advantages and disadvantages of timing such trips early in the assistance process? Late? In conjunction with what other occurrences in the assistance process?

Timing of bringing in outside resource people

What are the advantages and disadvantages of timing such events early in the assistance process? Late? In conjunction with what other occurrences in the assistance process?

Issues of Conflict and Balance

Balance between pointing out areas where assisters disagree with site participants over issues and maintaining productive working relationships

For example: Where assisters and site participants disagree about what are useful and appropriate forms of parent participation in a school community, should such disagreement be talked through or passed over or what?

How can a team deal productively with conflicts which arise between the assisters and site participants?

Maintaining working relationships simultaneously with teachers and administrators (or parents and school staff)

How can assisters avoid getting caught in the middle when teachers and administrators are in conflict?

Where the felt needs of different groups within a school community are in conflict, to what extent and how can an assistance group work simultaneously with these groups?

How can a team deal productively with conflicts in needs, goals and agendas between different groups within a site?

Facilitating the development of problem solving capacity

What is meant by facilitating? To what extent is it providing advice and information? To what extent is it doing things for clients? To what extent is modeling a way of facilitating? Something else?

What kinds of dependency by site participants on the team should be avoided? What kinds of neutral or useful?

What aspects of team roles support the facilitation process? How?

Follow up

What does follow-up mean?

What is the relationship between follow-up and dependency?

What is the relationship between follow-up and facilitation?

When should follow-up occur? When not? What is too much follow-up? Too little?

Issues about the Facilitator Role

Location of team base

How does being based in the same city influence the nature of facilitator roles which are developed?

How does long distance commuting influence the nature of the roles?

Is geography only one dimension of accessibility?

Role adaptability

To what extent is it useful to alter assigned team roles as special needs of clients can be met by special talents of team members (e.g., Yvonne or Phil (TA-Doc Linker) doing photography?

Work Overload

How can a team deal effectively with the issue of work overload for example, where a facilitator who can do a variety of things is being pushed and pulled in many directions?

What is the relationship between role adaptability and work overload?

Issues about linkage

Clarification of responsibility

Who has the ultimate responsibility for seeing that funded site and other external information gets used?

How is the delegated responsibility shared by individual and team components of the project?

How can the sharers of this responsibility coordinate their efforts so as to maximize the testing of the usefulness of funded site information at assistance sites, including testing the usefulness of negative data?

Supporting linkage

What are some instances where more interaction can take place between Documentation and TA team members? How?

Are there additional role structures that can be created to encourage more interaction between TA and Documentation team members?

How useful has the TA-Doc Linker role been? Should it be modified in any ways to enhance its usefulness?

Identifying potential linkage

How are potential links with funded site information identified?

Who identifies links usefully?

Usefulness of different kinds of information

How can factual information with minimal context be useful? (facts, computer stored data bits, materials from funded sites)

How can general patterns which have been identified be useful? (knowledge about components of organizational problem solving capacity)

How can lore be useful? (as gained from visiting to funded sites; as represented by visiting funded site participants; as described orally by the team; as represented in documentary form, including videotapes, pictures, case studies; as gained by assistance site participants through direct access to funded site contacts)

Preparation of assistance site participants for information

How can facilitators prepare assistance site participants for funded site information which is to be introduced:

What preparation is necessary before different kinds of information can be usefully introduced?

Conveying information to assistance site participants

How can funded site information be prepared for use and effectively conveyed to assistance site participants so that it can be used by them?

How can it be conveyed through documentary forms (case studies, summaries of data, materials from sites, etc.)?

How can it be conveyed through face to face exchanges between team members and assistance site participants?

How can it be conveyed through fact to face exchanges between funded site participants and assistance site participants?

In conclusion one question may be raised which has relevance for each of the above issues and questions: How does each issue or component of the assistance work compare with each other issue and/or component in terms of its relative contribution to productive assistance in schools? Some may be crucial always, others crucial sometimes. A next step may be to propose critical combinations of circumstances which generate school improvement.

REFERENCES

Holliday, Frances and Lesley Olswang
1974 School Community Program in Early Childhood Development. Evanston, IL: Evanston Public Schools.

Holmes, Manford
1977a Use of Documentary and Face-to-Face Interaction in Working Toward School Improvement. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

1977b Technical Assistance-Documentation Linker Roles in DTA. Chicago: Center for New Schools.

King, Yvonne
1977 Toward a Handbook for Technical Assisters on Information Utilization. Chicago: Center for New Schools.